

Geo. Kittner.

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

Published by the

Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other States.



St. Louis:

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE.

Entered at the Post Office of St. Louis, Mo., as second class matter in November 1896
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized October 5, 1918.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Origen Against Celsus. - - - - -	1
Materials for the Catechist. - - - - -	19
Luther's Struggle in Behalf of the Christian Church. - - - - -	50
The Proof Texts of the Catechism with a Practical Commentary. - - - - -	56
Book Review. - - - - -	60

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XXIII.

JANUARY, 1919.

No. 1.

ORIGEN AGAINST CELSUS.

It must be a welcome opportunity to all Christian teachers and preachers at least, and to all students of theology, if not to all Christians, to gain a closer vision of the first elaborate attack upon Christianity preserved to us, to which, as far as we know, any scholar and thinker of the pagan world condescended. We see in Tacitus (*Annals* 15, 44) and Pliny (*Epp.* 10, 96) with what haughty contempt such leaders of culture referred to the humble and despised sect, and with what consummate ignorance, we may add. This was during the reign of Trajan (98—117 A. D.). Under the Antonines a Greek philosopher, Celsus, published a special treatise against the Christians. The allusions to the distressful and troublous situation of the empire, when Celsus wrote, the great war on the Danubian frontier which Marcus Aurelius was compelled to undertake in 178, which he carried on in 179, and in which he died without bringing it to completion, in 180—this era best fits the allusion by Celsus. In 177 had occurred the terrible persecution at Lyons and elsewhere: Celsus intimates (VIII, 68) that the Christians are not sincerely loyal to the emperor; he says outright that, “if all [the subjects of the Roman empire] were to do the same as you [the typical Christian], nothing will prevent him [the emperor] from being left alone and desolate, and things on earth fall under the control of the most wicked and most savage barbarians [the Marcomanni], and no rumor left either of your own worship [the Christian] or of true philosophy.” I do not share the view of many scholars, even of Origen himself in the earlier part of his treatise, that this

Celsus was the Epicurean Celsus, the personal friend of Lucian [Alexander *e pseudomantis*], a contemporary, it is true, of Marcus Aurelius. Our Celsus is too pronounced and thoroughgoing a Platonist to identify him with that Epicurean. Oil and water would blend or amalgamate much more readily than these two forms of philosophy. Celsus was long dead when Origen composed or published his *critique* of, or rejoinder to, the monograph of the pagan classic philosopher. Origen, I say, wrote in 246 A. D., under Emperor *Philippos Arabs*,¹⁾ when the Alexandrine scholar was more than sixty years old, and dedicated this important controversial work to his friend Ambrosius (whom once he had converted from Gnosticism), whose liberality had provided Origen with a strong staff of shorthand writers and of calligraphers to copy the work of the former. Some scholars place the date in 248. At all events, we are entitled to infer that the work of Celsus was very important and noted, that its attacks on Christianity needed at last an adequate answer, which, up to that time, it had not received from any Christian apologist, such as had been Minucius Felix, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, or Tertullian.

I.

Celsus presents his strictures and objections in a sequence of two parts specially planned. In the first and shorter one (I. II) the Platonist has a Jew speak and assume the Jewish point of view, the *animus* also of the Jew. In the second and greater part (Books III—VIII) *Celsus ipse loquitur*, where we see that the first part was a mere mask.

Celsus claimed that he had made a thorough study of his subject²⁾ — a sweeping statement, which Origen refuses to accept, whether of prophets or gospels,³⁾ and the “utterances of the apostles,” meaning, of course, the epistles.

Also, Celsus is bitter against the intellectual humility (I, 13) of the Christians, which Origen, however, confirms by

1) Euseb., *H. E.* VI, 36.

2) *Panta gar oida*, I, 12.

3) Especially the hidden sense of the parables therein contained.

citing 1 Cor. 3, 18, 19: "Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise," etc.

The impersonation of the Jewish position begins I, 28 (*prosopopoiei*), like a declaiming pupil in a theatrical school, Origen says.

The virgin birth, the Jew begins, was a fiction. Jesus was born in a mere Jewish hamlet, of a poor woman, a native, earning her living by spinning for wages. Her husband, a carpenter, cast her out, when he proved her an adulteress. Wandering an outcast, she gave birth to Jesus in a dark corner. On account of his poverty Jesus hired himself out as a laborer in Egypt, where he became acquainted with certain powers of wizard's craft, on which the Egyptians vaunt themselves, and thence returned to Palestine, proud of his powers, and proclaimed himself a god on account of them. The real father of Jesus (I, 32) was a soldier by the name of *Panthera*, who had corrupted the maiden.

Next the incidents at the baptism, the dove and the voice from heaven, are treated with scorn (I, 41).⁴⁾ "If you, Jesus, say this, that every human being created in accordance with divine providence is a *son of God* [the Unitarian view also, I believe], wherein would you differ from another?" (I, 57.)

Further the Jew says that Chaldeans were said to have been stirred by Jesus about his nativity and came, intending to worship him when still an infant, as a divine being, "*proskynesontas auton eti nepion hos Theon* (I, 58), and that they communicated this to Herod the Tetrarch, and that the latter sent and killed those born in the same time, believing that he had slain this one also with them, lest somehow, living further a proper span of time, he might become king." Later Jesus "attached to himself some ten or eleven men of evil repute (*epirretous*), publicans and boatmen of the worst character, and with these he ran away hither and thither, gaining his

4) Origen cites Isaiah 48, 16: "And now the Lord God and His Spirit hath sent Me."

living in a disgraceful fashion and with difficulty." (I, 62.) — "Why should you be carried away to Egypt when still an infant, lest you be slain? For it is not likely that a god has apprehensions about his death." (I, 66.) — "Angel's message? Could not the great God guard His own Son directly? What super-human craft (like Perseus, Amphion, Aiakos, Minos) did you display?" (I, 67.) "As for the raising of dead, or curing of ailments, feeding of the thousands, with copious remnants, by a few loaves of bread, etc., related by your disciples,—why, the Egyptian jugglers and wandering wizards for a few obols in the market-places will create similar hallucinations in their spectators; but we will not at once call them sons of gods for that." (I, 68.) (His bodily wants and needs contradicted his divine character.) The feats of Jesus were those of a God-hated and wretched mountebank (*goëtos*). (I, 71.)

Many other deceivers (such as Jesus was) might appear to those willing to be deceived. (II, 8.) "How were we going to deem him divine who produced none of those things which he announced, and when we, having convicted him, and declared him guilty and demanded that he be punished, hiding and trying to abscond in the most disreputable way (*eponeidistotata*), he was caught and betrayed by the very men he dubbed disciples? And still being a god, it was not the thing for him to flee, nor to be pinioned and led away, least of all by those who [like Judas—E. G. S.] had shared his company and specifically partaken of everything, and had had him a teacher, [for him] being deemed Savior and Son and Messenger of the supreme God, to be forsaken and surrendered." (II, 9.)

"While I [the impersonated Jew] could say many things about what happened to Jesus, things both true and not resembling that which was written by the disciples of Jesus, I voluntarily omit it." (II, 13.) "The disciples invented it that he foreknew and foretold all that happened to him."⁵⁾ The Jew

5) Origen here, for rebuttal, cites Matt. 10, 18: "And ye shall be brought before governors and kings for My sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles."

further urges that, "if Jesus had foreknown his fate [of suffering and death], why he did not avoid it, but fell in with (*synepipten*) that which he foreknew?"⁶

The Jew in Celsus next takes up Peter's denial of Christ. "If he really foretold both him who was to betray him and him who was to deny him, how would they not have been afraid of him as of a divine being (*hos Theon*), so that the one would not have betrayed him and the other not have denied him?" (II, 18.) Follows the logic of the Jews: "Either these things did not happen after they were foretold, for it is impossible [they should], or, since they happened, the having been foretold is proven a falsehood; for it is altogether impossible that those who had heard it in advance should still betray and deny him."⁷

Next, why the lamentation in Gethsemane and the utterance of prayer as to the passing of the cup, if Jesus really willed all this himself? Here we may exemplify Origen's counter-critique; he urges that this very item emphasizes the truth-loving determination of those who composed the Gospels, when they could have kept silent about it, or passed it over in silence (*parasiopesai*). Besides, he says, Celsus exaggerated the terms used in the Gospel-narrative. (II, 24.)

Further, says the Jew of Celsius, the real Messiah was to prove himself a great prince and a universal sovereign over all the earth. (II, 29.) The Christians call Jesus the *Logos* of God, whereas he was merely a human being, most dishonorably arrested and tortured to death. (II, 31.) The Davidic genealogies of Jesus (Matthew and Luke) are treated with scorn; the poor carpenter's wife had no idea that she was of such aristocratic lineage. (II, 32.) Pilate suffered nothing for condemning Jesus. (II, 34.) Further the purple robe, the reed-scepter, and the crown of thorns are cited. (II, 34.) Why did not Jesus save

6) Origen aptly cites as a parallel St. Paul, who foresaw what was to come in Jerusalem, and still went there; also Socrates, who refused, when in prison, to heed Crito.

7) Such dialectic exegesis seems to be the work of *Celsus personally*, as Origen understands it.

himself in the catastrophe? Why does he not *now* at least display something divine and bring to justice those who are [now] insulting both himself and the Father? (II, 35.) Jesus could not endure thirst on the cross, which even ordinary culprits often endure. (II, 37.) We Jews, of course, do not consider him divine, nor do we agree with you Christians that he endured these things for the benefit of men, that we, too [say the Christians], may despise chastisement. (II, 38.) We do not admit that Jesus was without blemish (*anepileptos*). (II, 42.)

The miracles are treated as tricks of a magician. Why should the one be deemed son of God, and the traveling wizards and magicians merely jugglers and mountebanks? (II, 49.) What induced you to believe that he would rise again? (54.) Why shall we believe that the stories telling of the descent to the lower world of Orpheus, Protesilaos, Hercules, were mere myths, but consider the report or vision of a woman half-frantic⁸⁾ as sound?⁹⁾ (II, 55.) Jesus should have been seen by those who had dealt despitefully with him, and by Pilate, and, in a word, by *all*. (II, 63.) Why did he not vanish from the cross? (II, 69.) What god appearing among men is disbelieved? (II, 74.) Where is he now?—that we may see and believe. (II, 77.) “He, then, was a human being after all, and such a one as truth presents and reason demonstrates.” (II, 79.)

I must content myself with this mere summary in this Jewish and minor part of Celsus’s “True Word” or “Discourse,” the first (for us) elaborate polemic from the Gentile camp against the Christian faith. We cannot stop here merely to glance at the admirable and searching dissensions in rebuttal by Origen; they are strong in dialectic, in historical analysis, and, above all, in thorough command of Scriptural learning. But let us now go forward to that curious blending of philosophy and classical culture with the stubborn effort to maintain the ancestral polytheism, which we see asserted by Celsus him-

8) *Gyne paroistros*—Mary Magdalene.

9) Here the critique of David Strauss is anticipated.

self as his own thesis and as the attitude of the leaders in the Roman Empire.

As for Celsus, he really looks down upon both Christians and Jews with undisguised contempt, and has formed his own theory. He now speaks personally and directly. The Christians and Jews are both fools for believing in a Messiah, but disagreeing whether he already has come or is to come. (III, 1.) As the Jews seceded from the Egyptians, so the Christians seceded from the Jews. (5.) If all mankind should be willing to be Christians, the Jews would still form an exception. (9.) The Christians were united at first, but now are splitting up into many sects and factions.¹⁰⁾ (10.) Celsus agrees, however, in one matter, *viz.*, in retributive justice to be dealt out to the wicked. (16.) Of the gross idolatry of Egypt the philosopher speaks with respect. He reminds us here of Plutarch (*De Iside et Osiri*): one must discover the hidden meanings and the *Eternal Ideas* concealed under the forms of these grosser cults (19; against all of which Origen cites 1 Cor. 2, 6—8).

Celsus, as other antagonists of Christianity before, in order to discredit the Christian conception of the human-divine in Christ, put forward parallels, as they thought they were, from Greek mythology: Hercules, Aesculapius, Dionysos, the Dioscuri. Many barbarians indeed and Greeks, Celsus claimed, admitted that they had actually seen Aesculapius.¹¹⁾ So the Getae worship Zamolxis, the Cilicians Mopsos, the Acarnanians Amphilochos, the Lebadaeans, Trophonios (34), as the Christians worship one who was captured and died. Celsus even goes so

10) Clearly the Gnostic sects and heresies are meant. The pagan world did not differentiate them from the plain Gospel-church. So Justin Martyr, who wrote his first *Apology* under Antoninus Pius, after having described the claims of Simon Magus and his disciple Menander, and referred to the doctrines of the famous Gnostic Marcion and to his teaching, then, going on, proceeds thus (*First Apology*, 26): *Pantes hoi apo touton hormomenoi, hos ephemen, Christianoi kalountai*; and Justin, disdaining any personal knowledge of their specific meetings and worship, calls attention to the important fact that the persecutions of the Roman government *did not extend to them*.

11) or his snake. Cf. Aristophanes's *Plutus*, or Lucian's *Alexander*.

far as to assert that the divine honors shown to Antinous, the drowned concubine of the Emperor Hadrian, especially in Egypt, are just as sound as those paid to Christ by the Christians. (36.)

Celsus further charges that the Christians positively bar wise and cultured people from their communion (which Origen denies), and, that they are willing and able to gain or persuade only the foolish and low-born and the stupid and the slaves and women-folk and children. (44.)¹²⁾ Celsus becomes bitter here; he intimates that Christian preaching is like the work of the mountebanks who gather the common folk there, but would never be admitted among cultured and thinking men, and then he sets forth how weavers, shoemakers, fullers ply their Christian propaganda with children. (55.)

To the mysteries and initiation of the Greeks were invited only those whose hands were clean and whose conscience pure. Not so the Christians. "Whoever, they say, is a sinner, whoever is simple, and, to speak plainly, whoever is a poor devil, him the kingdom of God will receive." (59.) "To say that God should have been sent for the sinners, but will not receive the just!" (62), while real conversion of the bad is impossible (65); and whenever Christians are crowded in argument, they resort to the omnipotence of God, so that God admits those who wail, and rejects the good. No sensible man is persuaded by the doctrine. (73.) The Christians say to the ignorant and foolish: "Flee from the physicians! See to it that none of you ever take hold of knowledge!" (75.) Christian teaching is as though a drunken man were to come among the drunken and then abuse the sober as though *they* were drunk (76), or as though the Christian teacher were like a man with ailing and defective eyesight, who finds fault with the keen-eyed among whom he came, treating them as blear-eyed. (77.) In a word, the Christians seduce bad men with windy hopes. (77.)

12) In rejoinder, Origen insists on a proper understanding of 1 Cor. 1, 18, and what St. Paul really had in mind there.

IV. In this book we must make some election. I fear I cannot enumerate all the data. Celsus rejects the doctrine of Christ's descent from God. Does not God *know* what happens among men? Or has He an itch for display like the newly rich, and must He resort to incarnation to test the believers and the unbelievers? Would not this be a very mortal ambition? Why did God conceive this plan only after so long a time? (7.) It is incompatible with a proper conception of God to say that He will descend and destroy the world with fire. God cannot undergo such a change [from His bliss] as this would involve. (14.) Further on Celsus returns to his favorite theme, *viz.*, his unmeasured contempt for Christians and Jews both, comparing them to bats, ants, frogs in some corner of a morass, holding a general political meeting, disputing as to who were the greater sinners, claiming special revelation and God's particular care, as elect, to the end that they may dwell with Him forever, while He will destroy the wicked with fire. (23.) The story of Adam and Eve is a myth for old women. Celsus then goes over much of Genesis from Paradise to Goshen and beyond. Perhaps he had scholars like Philo in mind, or others, when he referred to the anthropopathic traits like anger, hatred, etc., ascribed to Jehovah in the texts of the Old Testament: *Kai Ioudaion kai Christianon hoi epieikesteroi taut' allegorou-sin.* (48.) Presently Celsus reveals himself as a consistent Platonist: "God [the good God of Plato's *Ideal World*] made nothing mortal" — He made the soul, but not the body. (52.) We may compare Plato's *Timaeus* 69, C. D. Evil is not from God, but bound up with matter.¹³⁾ As for repentance and spiritual betterment of mankind, Celsus sets it down as an axiom that the quantity of good and evil in the world always remains approximately the same (69); he denies that creation is for man (76), claims that brute creatures are better provided for by Nature than man is;¹⁴⁾ urges man's helplessness in primitive times; denies the sovereignty of man over Nature (78. 79); to one looking down from heaven men would not appear much

13) Similarly the greater number of the Gnostics.

14) Cf. on this Plato's *Protagoras*, 320 D—321 B.

different from bees and ants, which have all the social virtues of man. (81—85.) With all his superior philosophy Celsus believes in mantic birds, or “birds of the gods.” Storks, in fact, are more devoted to filial duty than men. (98.) Man is by no means the apex and purpose of the universe (as Genesis has it). Incidentally, Celsus also denies the Stoic theory of cosmic cycles of destruction and creation. (99.)

V. We now reach the *vinculum* which still prevailed between philosophy and polytheism, or nature-worship. Why do not the Jews worship the heavenly bodies? Are not they the sources of all our material blessings? Here Celsus is almost eloquent: as though one could conceive *the whole as being God*,¹⁵⁾ *but his parts not as divine!*—These forces, then, which so clearly and splendidly make utterance to all men, through which rain and heat and clouds and thunder come to men, and lightning and crops and the young, through which God revealed Himself,—why not worship these? (6.)

There was considerable repetition in the original treatise. Celsus again (14) attacks the Christian belief in the Judgment. He then goes on to argue as follows: All nations have their own institutions and customs, and so, too, their own religions; it is proper that this be so. So the Jews, too. Why, then, did the Christians forsake the Jews? (35.) Moreover, we see how old Deism really is: As for the supreme deity, names were immaterial: whether Zeus or Zen, or Adonai, or Sabaoth, or Ammon. Circumcision does not render the Jews any holier, as vegetarianism does not endow the Pythagoreans with any particular degree of saintliness.

He further on enlarges on the many sects among the Christians, and we see clearly (as in Clement of Alexandria, too) that pagan observers considered all Gnostics simply as Christians. Again he says once more that the worshipers of Antinous in Egypt are better than many Christian sects (63), which latter bitterly calumniated one another (he really meant the Gnostics and the orthodox Christians).

15) So near are pantheism and polytheism together, as Ulrici very properly observed in his article on “Pantheismus” in Herzog.

VI. Celsus goes on to say that all the highest truths (about God and religion) were much better set down among the Greeks, without any revelation and without any Son of God. He cites a passage (of very moderate pertinency) from Plato's Seventh Epistle (spurious) as saying that the insight into the First Good was gained within the inner circle of those who were admitted to personal contact with that sage. Now, Plato did not claim any divine revelation or sonship of God for himself, while the Christians say: "Believe if you wish to be saved, or go away!" (11.) Celsus even asserts that Christ, in warning against the spiritual danger of riches and speaking of the ear of the needle,¹⁶⁾ had borrowed this idea from Plato, who said:¹⁷⁾ "For a man who is good in a distinguished degree to be rich also in a distinguished degree is impossible." The Platonist Celsus then enlarges on the descent of souls to earth, the bloody rites of the Mithras-cult, and its symbolism. (22.) In a long *excursus* (24—39) he deals with the Ophite Gnostics and their *Diagramma*, as though they were genuine Christians.¹⁸⁾ Further on Satan is set off against certain legends of Greek mythology, the struggles of Kronos with Ophioneus, the Titans and Gigantes battling with Zeus, or Typhon and Horos opposed to Osiris in Egyptian myths.¹⁹⁾ (42. 599.) Again Celsus returns to the theme of Creation, the treatment of which by Moses he calls naive (*euethike*). (49.) As to this, indeed, he confesses himself an agnostic (53), and then takes up the theories of the

16) Matt. 19, 24; Mark 10, 25; Luke 18, 25.

17) *Leges V*, 12, 743 a.

18) The Ophites were called so from *ophis*, the serpent of Genesis. I quote from Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, transl. by Torrey, 6th Am. ed., 1853, Vol. 1, p. 444, note 4: "The serpent, a type of the *zoogonos sophia*, — the winding shape of the entrails presents the form of a serpent, — a symbol of that wisdom of nature, that soul of the world, which winds in concealment through all the different grades and orders of natural life. . . . We perceive how the pantheistic principle shines here more clearly through the surface."

19) We see the firmly established habit of the later pagan classical world to preserve their oldest literature and legends by allegorical interpretation, and also to yield to a syncretism which endeavored to fuse the paganism of other lands with the polytheism of Greece and Rome.

Marcionite Gnostics on this matter, who separated the Creator-God from the Good God.

This brings Celsus to the greatest of all his themes: "From Him are all things." "God is not attainable by human reason"; "He is not namable" (this is true in a way, Origen says); "He has not experienced any modification of essence attainable by human terms" (65); "how, then," says an imaginary interlocutor in Celsus, "shall I understand God, and how shall I learn the way that leads to Him, and how do you point Him out to me? For now certainly you cast darkness before my eyes, and I see nothing clearly." (66.) From these (necessarily vague and indefinite) theses of his own, from this confession of the essential impotence of man to comprehend and define God, Celsus returns to, and resumes, his task of overthrowing Christianity. He claims that Christ, in calling God Spirit (John 4, 24), did not differ from the Stoics and their permeating spirit. (71.) How could a Son of God, endowed with a mortal body, be immortal? (72.) If God could send a spirit, why did He for His messenger need incarnation through a woman's womb? Could He not create a full-fledged man offhand, and not forbear "injecting His own spirit into such a polluted thing" (*kai me to idion pneuma eis tosouton miasma embalein*)? "This would not [now] be the object of disbelief, if he had been at once begotten from above" (*ei anthen euthys esparto*). (73.) There were, after all, two sons of God, one of the Creator-God and the other of Marcion's god. Celsus's scorn and bitterness go so far that he compares these to two fighting quails. (74.) Christ's physical presence, too, should properly have been of surpassing majesty and beauty. Perhaps, Origen suggests, Celsus had heard of Is. 53, 2. 3: "He hath no form nor comeliness. . . . He is despised and rejected of men: a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," etc., for conceiving Jesus so meanly. (76.)—How could the omniscient God fail to know that He was to send His Son to evil and sinful men, who ultimately were to chastise Him?²⁰⁾

20) Celsus regularly uses the term *kolazein*, as though it had been, in a measure, justified — the Jewish point of view, it would seem. (81.)

VII. Celsus now takes up prophets and prophecy. Christians rely on prophecy (2), but at the same time they despise the work done in the past by the oracles of Delphi, Dodona, Klaros, Branchidai, etc., especially in the work of sending out colonies. Celsus advances a psychological and naturalistic way²¹⁾ as to how they fill themselves gradually with certain conceits or hallucination. "It is a thing ready at hand and customary for them to say, 'I am God, or a son of God, or a divine spirit. And I have arrived; for presently the universe is destroyed, and you, men, on account of your acts of wrongdoing, are done for. But I wish to save; and you will see me again returning with heavenly power. Blessed is he who has worshiped me now; but upon all the others I shall cast eternal fire, both upon cities and lands; and men who know not their own penalties shall in vain change their opinions and shall groan; but those who believe in me I shall preserve throughout eternity.'" Clearly we have here a caricatured echo of the Gospels by a proud pagan reader thereof, with an abundance of attestation of St. Paul's ever memorable phrase: *Moria tois Hellestin*, "and to the Greeks foolishness." And I do not believe that the modern deist or agnostic would even desire to make much change in the pronouncement of Celsus to adopt it as his own. (9.)—

Celsus speaks with undisguised scorn of Christ's suffering and death and the prophecy thereof: that it was necessary that God should die, or live the life of a slave (*douleucin*), since it was prophesied, in order that after his death it might be believed that he was god. Prophesied or not, says Celsus, the point is, were these happenings *intrinsically* worthy of a divine being? Of course they were not. One is almost tempted to say that the proud and scornful words above were Celsus's own reply to Luke 24, 25—27.

As to the Christian hope of eternal happiness, Celsus cites for his own side the Elysian fields and the Isles of the Blessed, quoting from Homer and from Plato's *Phaedo*, 109 A. B; 28.

21) Somewhat in the later Renan's manner.

As for the Christian doctrine of resurrection, that was due to the fact that the Christians had heard something of the shifting of souls into other bodies (*metensomatismis*), which they had misunderstood. (32.)

And now our Platonist draws from his quiver what he certainly considered one of his finest arrows: How will men perceive God? What can one learn without sense-perception? That, the Platonist Celsus says, is a gross carnal question. (36.) A cowardly and body-loving race you Christians are indeed! You must learn to see with the eyes of the soul! Then only will you see God. Of course, you should not heed those who are wooing the idols, *but you must not blaspheme the gods that are demonstrated [as such], as though they were mere idols, while you revere Him who is more wretched than the idols, and is merely a corpse, and seek a father like unto Him.* (36.)

After again referring to the Ophites as though they were Christians (40), Celsus remands the believers in Jesus to inspired poets, to sages and philosophers, and particularly, of course, to Plato, citing the oft-quoted passage in Plato's *Timaeus* (28. c): "To find the Maker and Father of this universe is a task, and having found, to state it to everybody is impossible." Celsus takes this as his text for a brief exegetical discourse: "You see how seers, too, seek the way to truth; and Plato knew that for all men to proceed in this way was impossible. But since on this account it has been devised by wise men how we might get some conception of the Unnamable and First One, a conception making Him manifest either by synthesis with the other things, or by analysis from them, or by analogy, wishing to teach that which otherwise is unspeakable. I should wonder if you shall be able to follow, being utterly bound up in the flesh and espying nothing pure." (42.)

Wishing further to illumine the benighted Christians, Celsus continues to cite from *his* gospel, Plato (*Rep. VI*, 507 to 509), which I must summarize. The real essence of things and so knowledge and truth can only be gained by intelligence,

whereas the senses deal only with the passing mutations and recurrent phenomena of material things. What the sun is to the physical eye and to all the life of the material world reached by the eye, "that, in the intelligible world, is That One who is neither mind nor the act of intelligence, nor knowledge, but is to the mind the cause of perception and to intelligence the cause of its existence, on his account, and to knowledge the cause of understanding on his account, and for all intelligible things and for Truth itself and for Essence itself the cause of their being, being beyond all, being perceptible by some unspeakable power."²²⁾

After thus quoting the text of his great master, Celsus turns to the Christians: "There is the truth and the real revelation for you, the spirit issuing from God: if you are incompetent to seize upon these things, then hold your tongues, and cover up your stolidity, and do not say that those who see are blind, and those who run are lame, when you yourselves are absolutely paralyzed as to your souls and truncated as to your extremities, and living in the body, *i. e.*, in the carcass." What intellectual pride have we here!

Celsus urges the Christians to accept some new Christ, if not Hercules or Aesculapius, why not Orpheus, or Anaxarchos (far famed for his heroic death), or the famous Stoic Epictetus of Nicopolis,²³⁾ whose patience Celsus extols above that of Jesus, "your God." You put spurious stuff into the Sibylline collections, and him who had the most ill-spoken life (*bio epirrheto-tato*) and the most pitiable death you make a god. (53.) Why not take Jonas or Daniel?

Celsus himself regrets the worship of the idols — none but a fool would so hold them.²⁴⁾ He says it over and over that the

22) The ecstasy of the Neoplatonists, such as Plotinus in the third century.

23) See my article on "Stoicism and Christianity," *Biblical Review*, N. Y., July, 1917. E. G. S.

24) But compare the testimony of Pausanias, the Periegete, the contemporary of Celsus. See my article, "Under the Antonines," *Biblical Review*, April, 1918.

Christians worship a corpse. And as a consistent Platonist he repeats: all inferior cosmic or physical powers hold from the greatest God; hence, *through these undergods* the great supreme God is revered. (68.) Thus Platonism and polytheism are deftly fused.

VIII. "The Christians tear themselves from the rest of mankind: they erect a wall between themselves and those who worship the undergods of tradition." (2.) "The assertion of monotheism is seditious; it implies that the Christians set up a counter-god over against the general God (of the Platonists). But as a matter of fact the Christians *are* no genuine monotheists; for they excessively worship (*hyperthreskenousin*) this one who appeared recently, and still they hold that they do not go wrong about God, if His servant, too, shall be made an object of service (*therapeulthesetai*)."¹² (12.) Celsus calls Christ "the very one who is for them the ringleader of their rebellion (*tes staseos archegetes*); and they dubbed this one Son of God, not because they revere God very much, but because they extol this one very much."¹³ (14.) Celsus now cites from a Gnostic publication concerning the two gods, and the injunction not to serve two masters. (15.) The characteristic avoidance of setting up altars and cult-figures and temples is maintained by the Christians because they see in this avoidance a watchword or symbol "*of their secret and forbidden association*."¹⁴ (17.) (We have here a veritable historical record that Christianity was then, under the Antonines, not a *RELIGIO LICITA*, as Judaism was.) "Why do the Christians not share in the sacrificial feasts of their Gentile fellow-citizens? One must pray to the *daimones*," says our Neoplatonist, "in order that they may be gracious" (*hina eumeneis osi*). For the *daimones*, too, belong to God. The Pythagorean, of course [to whom the eating of meat was forbidden by his philosophical creed], may abstain. "Do not the Christians realize that they are *always* guests (*synestioi*) of the *daimones* (undergods); that is to say, whenever they eat bread and drink wine or water, breathe air, then they are

the beneficiaries of certain undergods, to whom these provinces are assigned." (28.) "As for you Christians, either get out of life altogether, or give first-fruits and prayers to the undergods, to whom terrestrial things are allotted." (33.) "Now we must court these physical powers, as we would court Roman or Parthian officials, who can injure us if treated with insolence." (35.) "When the professing Christian is banished from land and sea, and you are put in prison and crucified, why does not your 'Son of God' come to the aid of the sufferer? You Christians scorn the cult-figures; you would not dare so to treat Dionysos or Hercules in person! Those who punished your God [on Golgotha] suffered nothing for it in all the rest of their lives. But what novel experience came to him who believed himself to be not a human wizard (*goes*), but Son of God? Did he, then, who sent him permit all this, *viz.*, his cruel punishment, and also, incidentally, the destruction of his message? And all this time the Father paid no attention to him. Perhaps he willed it so, as you say; hence the extraordinary insolence which the Son underwent (*perihybrizeto*)."

"But the pagan deities," Celsus continues,²⁵⁾ "resent insolence; they cause the scorner to flee and hide himself, or have him taken and put to death." (41.) One must rate highly the inspired work of oracles, the work of the *haruspices*, or the appearance of ghosts. What benefits have not oracles conveyed [Celsus again repeats himself], as in the founding of colonies! (45.) Eternal punishment? Why, you will find that, too, in the mystic rites (Eleusinian, Orphic, etc.). You threaten them; they threaten you. (48.)

As for the resurrection of the body, the Platonist Celsus speaks with glowing scorn of this attachment to the material body, and incidentally gives vent to his intellectual contempt of the Christians. "For these are they who also in the other respects are boorish and vile (*agroikoi kai akathartoi*), and without reason are sharing the disease of the rebellious sect

25) Cf. the story of Pentheus at Thebes.

(*te stasei synnosountes*). As for them, they are nothing. I will talk with those who hope that they will have an eternal life with God. *They are right in this* that those who have lived well will be happy, but the unrighteous will be altogether afflicted with *eternal evils.*" Plato, for most evil-doers, had set them periodic or limited penalties. The body *per se* is really a penalty.

"As for the Christians, they ought to vanish from the earth, or have no offspring, if they disapprove of pagan worship. Or let them share to the full in all civic duties, perform the local sacrifices." In other words, we have that characteristic combination of Platonism with a practical belief in the undergods, that they can injure, and can prophesy (60), a blending of philosophy and polytheism which more and more came to dominate the latter and last stages of classic paganism — the dusk of the gods, as Servius and Macrobius exhibit it. The soul must always be intent upon God (*tetastho pros ton Theon*). (63.)

Celsus seems to respect the consistency of martyrs. (66.) But if any one bid you bless the Sun or Athena with a beautiful hymn, in this (doing this) you will seem the more to revere the great God; for piety traversing all things becomes more perfect.

Be loyal to the emperor! If all were to do what you do, he would be forlorn, and the world would fall under the sway of the barbarians. (68.) What has your God done for the Jews, who have no clod of their own, nor altar? And as for you, you are skulking from persecution! (69.)

Now follows, almost at the very conclusion of this polemic, a very curious utterance of Celsus. He intimates that, if the emperor should become a Christian and then be captured by the barbarians, and if this process should repeat itself over and over again, civilization would come to an end. Help the emperor! Even hold governmental office! Do this for the sake of preserving the laws and piety. (75.)

University Heights, New York City.

E. G. SIHLER.

(To be concluded.)

MATERIALS FOR THE CATECHIST.

EIGHTH OUTLINE.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT. Qu. 38—44.

“Charity begins at home,” how often has not this proverbial saying been applied to pervert the principle which has been inculcated in the Second Table of the Decalogue! Yet, differently understood, it contains a divine truth: that love of the neighbor which God enforces by means of the last seven commandments starts, indeed, at home. Our neighborly relations begin with our birth, and the holy law of love commences its operations for us in that very circle of persons which surround us at our entrance into life. They treat us truly as their neighbors; for without their service, in our helpless distress in those early years, we should perish. (3, 1094.) The manner in which we are to treat them, and all who, like them, are engaged in safeguarding our existence, is shown in the Fourth Commandment, which makes us acquainted with

I. Our Superiors. Qu. 40.

A. The persons concerning whom duties are here laid upon us are not merely objects of our love, but we are bidden to “honor” them. “Honor belongs to God alone; and now He bestows honor on father and mother.” (3, 1093.) “Love is extended to our equals, as when two love one another, neither esteems himself superior to the other. But honor is directed toward a superior, and is accompanied by fear, lest we insult the person whom we honor. It subjects us to him as to a lord.” (3, 1101.) God “separates and distinguishes” the persons whom He sets before us in this commandment “above all other persons upon earth, and places them next to Himself. For to honor is far higher than to love, inasmuch as it comprehends not only love, but also modesty, humility, and deference as though to a majesty there hidden.” We are to “regard these persons as, next to God, the very highest . . . as in God’s stead.” (L.C., 405.) That is the reason, Luther thinks, why the Fourth Commandment heads the Second Table. “The first (commandment on the Second Table) teaches us our proper conduct toward all superiors, who are in the place of God. . . . For this reason

this Fourth Commandment follows after the first three, which treat of God Himself." (3, 1093. 1223.)

B. The basic thought, then, of the Fourth Commandment is recognition of divinely ordained authorities. It refers to the relation of superiors and inferiors, of governors and the governed.

1. Our parental superiors and governors are named in the commandment proper. "A high opinion of our parents springs from a consideration of God and His will. For a pious child will reflect thus: If the highest Majesty did not consider this person unworthy of being my father or mother, why should they appear unworthy to me? If it pleased the supreme God to form and create me in them, why should I be displeased with having had my origin and creation in them? For what is it that parents do to give their child its form? They never reflect whether it will be a boy or girl, whether it will have eyes, ears, feet, whether it will be living or still-born, whether it will have hair or not. Accordingly, I shall reverence the workshop of my God, who has formed me. I will not keep my eyes on the poverty, the uncouthness, the low descent of my parents, but on God, the Master Workman. Thus, the reverence due God descends indeed upon the parents; it is not caused by the parents when we regard them as flesh and blood, but when we behold in them the workshop of the highest Majesty. . . . Here, too, is a workshop that takes the place of God; hence this commandment differs from the three preceding only in this respect, that in the former God is honored by Himself, while in this He is honored in another, namely, in our regents, who are His chair, His workshop, His altar, His throne of grace." (3, 1224.)

The parental authority is shared by grandparents (*progonoi*, 1 Tim. 5, 4) and other blood relations of the parents, who, not infrequently, have a direct interest in the children of their nearest relatives. It passes over, in the event of the parents' death or their withdrawal from a child to legal parents, such as step-parents, foster-parents, and guardians.

The authority of the father takes precedence over that of the mother, in the event that the two clash. God names the father first in the Commandment and in Prov. 23, 23. His creative order started with the man, who was made the head of the wife. *Patris potestas praestat.*¹⁾

1) In Lev. 19, 3 the mother is placed before the father. The Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Syriac, regarding this as an error of the copyist,

2. With the increase of the human race social conditions became complex. The parental authority which had sufficed for the regulation of family life in the first home had to be made applicable to new relations. Large families and estates required servants; for the systematic education of a child teachers other than the child's parents became necessary; in a growing community the common rights of many parents had to be so ordered as not to interfere with the individual rights of each. Thus the parental authority and domestic government branched out. "All authority flows and is propagated from the authority of parents. For where a father is unable alone to educate his [rebellious and irritable] child, he employs a schoolmaster that he may instruct it; if he be too weak, he obtains the assistance of his friends and neighbors; if he departs, he confers and delegates his authority and government to others who are appointed for the purpose. Likewise he must have domestics, man-servants and maid-servants, under him for the management of the household, so that all whom we call masters are in the place of parents, and must derive their power and authority to govern from them. *Hence also they are called fathers in the Scriptures*, as those who in their government perform the functions of the office of a father, and should have a paternal heart toward their subordinates. As also from antiquity the Romans and other nations called the masters and mistresses of the household *patres et matres familias*, that is, housefathers and housemothers. So also they called their national rulers and chiefs *patres patriae*, that is, fathers of the country, for a great shame to us who would be Christians that we do not call them so, or, at least, do not esteem and honor them as such." (L. C., 410 f.) Scriptural precedence, then, caused Luther to insert in his explanation of the Fourth Commandment the words "and masters." "We have two kinds of fathers presented in this commandment, fathers in blood and fathers in office, or those to whom belongs the care of the family, and those to whom belongs the care of the nation." (L. C., 413.)

a. Domestic government is ordained by 1 Pet. 2, 18. *Oiketai* (from *oikos*) are "the domestics" (from *domus*), not only slaves (*dou-*

have reversed the order. But Lange, defending the original order, which has also been retained by Luther and the Authorized Version, says: "The mother precedes the father in the duty of mankind." Wordsworth says in reference to this order: "In the former chapter God had displayed the evils consequent on the abuse of woman, and here He inculcates reverence towards her, as the foundation of social happiness.—*Lange-Schaff Commentary*.

loi), but also freedmen. These are to regard the *despotai* as placed over them, while *they* are under them (*hypotassomenoi*). "That the term 'father' embraces also masters, you can see from 2 Kings 5, 13, where the servants of Naaman call him father. Hence the name house-father." (3, 1242.)

b. Pedagogical, or educational, government, as a species of the parental, can be illustrated by the name "father" which Elisha gives to his teacher Elijah (2 Kings 2, 12; the same name is applied to Elisha by King Joash, 2 Kings 13, 14). It expresses what Elijah had been to his successor, and Elisha to the King, by the instruction and admonition which he had given him.

c. Secular, or political, government is declared to be of divine origin in Rom. 13, 1. 2. Paul here speaks of *exousiae hyperechousai*, authorities which are high in standing, and of their correlates as people who must be under them (*hypotassesetho*). Such a relation between magistrates and subjects is divinely ordained; it does not exist apart from God (*ei me hypo Theou*). And it makes no difference in what form the higher power exists; such as it is (*hai de ousai*), it is set up by God. "Thus Paul has certainly expressed the divine right of magistracy, which Christian princes especially designate by the expression 'by the grace of God' (since the time of Louis the Pious). And *hai de ousai*, the *extant*, actually *existing*, allows no exception, such as that possibly of tyrants and usurpers (in opposition to *Reiche*). The Christian, according to Paul, ought to regard any magistrate whatever, provided its rule over him subsists *de facto*, as divinely ordained, since it has not come into existence without the operation of God's will; and this applies also to tyrannical or usurped power, although such a power, in the counsel of God, is perhaps destined merely to be temporal and transitional. From this point of view the Christian obeys not the human caprice and injustice, but the will of God, who — in connection with His plan of government, inaccessible to human insight — has presented even the unworthy and unrighteous ruler as the *ousa exousia*, and has made him the instrument of his measures." (Meyer.) When Peter (1 Ep. 2, 13) calls magistrates *ktisis anthropine*, a human ordinance, he declares that the form of a government may be determined by men, and that the government exists for men. But there is nothing in this text to contradict the statement in Rom. 13, 1. — Also governmental authority is related to the parental. When the Egyptian Pharaoh presented Joseph to the nation as a person to whom they must bow the knee, or, as Luther paraphrases the command, by declaring him "the father of the country," he expresses the thought that secular authority is an out-

growth of the parental.²⁾ The Romans called their Senators "conscript fathers," and Americans speak of the first President of the United States as "the Father of our country."

d. "Besides these, there are yet spiritual fathers; not like those in the Papacy, who have indeed caused themselves to be so designated,

2) Luther's rendering of *abrech* in Gen. 41, 43 hits the sense, although it is not a translation of the term. However, Luther knew that he was wrestling with a difficulty in this text. "The Hebrews have prepared a cross for themselves and for us out of this word *abrech*, for they interpret it many ways. The majority holds that it is one word, the rest make two words out of it: *ab*, which means 'father,' and *rech*, which means 'tender.' He is called 'father' on account of his wisdom, and *rech* on account of his youth. I hate the grammar of Cabalists. They also say that in the Syrian and in the Chaldean language the word *rech* has the same meaning as the Latin *rex*, king. But if we want to cabalize thus, I would far more easily connect the word *rech* with the German word 'reich.' Accordingly, I shall follow those who take *abrech* as one word, and interpret it to mean 'a very tender father of his country.'—The others trace the word to *barach*, which means 'to bless' or 'to bow the knee.' But this interpretation seems to conflict with the letter *a*, which is one of *heemanthi* letters, as they are called in Hebrew grammar. They say that *a* stands for *h*, which is an exchange of letters common among the Hebrews. Now, these interpret as follows: Pharaoh commanded everybody to bow the knee to Prince Joseph, an honor which is still accorded to princes at all courts. The Pope, too, has desired this honor, so much so that people who would not bow the knee to him when he was being carried across the street in his chair, as a being who considered it beneath him to walk on the ground, were beaten with rods. For in this manner they have from history collected all manner of ceremonies and royal pomp, and have appropriated them for this accursed man.—I take this word for an exclamation, meaning that the people shouted with a loud voice, and called and extolled Joseph as a father of his country, just as in our times the people express their loyalty to the emperor or prince by saying 'gracious lord,' to testify that they acknowledge him as their lord, and will be faithful and well disposed toward him." (2, 1400 f.) This shows that Luther knew the version of *abrech* which has been adopted by our English Bible. Tayler Lewis, in the *Lange-Schaff Commentary*, says: "It is not easy to see why there should have been so much pains to make out this word *abrech* to be a pure Egyptian word, or to deny its Shemitic origin. . . . The word is almost identical with *habrech*, the Hiphil imperative of *barach*, and its Hebrew sense, *bow the knee*, or *kneel* (just as we make the verb from the noun), would seem the meaning, of all others, best adapted to the context. The slight variation confirms this. Had it been simply dressing up a pure Egyptian word in a Hebrew form, there is no reason why the writer should not have

but have not performed the functions of the paternal office. For those only are to be called spiritual fathers who govern and guide us by the Word of God. Of this name St. Paul boasts (1 Cor. 4, 15), where he says: 'In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel.' Because they are fathers indeed, they are entitled to honor above all others." (*L. C.*, 413.) In accordance with this view of Luther, our Catechism speaks of persons who are "placed over us in the Church," hence of spiritual, or ecclesiastical, government. True, *Heb.* 13, 17 speaks of the relation that should exist between pastors and their congregations in terms which express subordination. The pastors are called "leaders," *hegoumenoi*, whom their people are to "obey," and to whom they are to "submit themselves." It is, then, in accordance with Scripture when we call our pastors "Reverends," persons who should be treated with marks of esteem and reverence. Paul would have those who labor in the Word and doctrine regarded as "worthy of double honor," 1 Tim. 5, 17. The term "domine," now used colloquially in the United States, was originally "a respectful title of address" in the Dutch Reformed Church. (*Stand. Dictionary.*) The term "father," whose applicableness to religious teachers Luther has shown on Scriptural grounds, while noting at the same time its misapplication by the priests of his day, has now become almost wholly appropriated by the Roman Catholic clergy, and would create a misunderstanding when applied to our pastors. Nevertheless, Lutherans have not entirely discarded this term; not only do we respect the writings of the ancient Church Fathers, as far as they have expounded Scriptural truth, but we also speak of "Father Luther," and of the "Fathers" of our Synod.

Nevertheless, the authority of Christian pastors over their flock is essentially different from any of the aforementioned forms of authority. The pastor has not the right to punish, which parents, masters, teachers, and magistrates have. His business is not at all with the secular relations of men. He wields no authority except by the Word of God, which he proclaims and applies to the hearts of those who are willing to hear him. In his *Exposition of the Distinction that must be Made between Spiritual and Secular Government*, which Luther wrote for Leonhard Beier of Zwickau, July 24, 1536, he says: "Inasmuch as our evangelical teaching most emphatically insists that these two governments, the secular and the spiritual, must

employed the proper Hebrew Hiphil. The word at this time, doubtless, belonged to both languages, but its solemn and public pronunciation in the shouting procession made the narrator prefer to keep the broader Egyptian sound of *a* for *h*."

be kept well apart and in no wise confounded, . . . therefore we pray and admonish you to firmly urge that this order be observed." (10, 265.)

e. Scripture enjoins a sort of social subordination upon the young towards the aged, both by precept, Lev. 19, 32; Prov. 20, 29; 1 Tim. 5, 1, and example, 2 Sam. 19, 32; Job 15, 10; however, not as a rule of etiquette and polite conduct,³⁾ but as a moral duty; for what is said in Lev. 19, 32 is followed immediately by the command: "Fear thy God." Honoring the aged is, therefore, a religious act.

C. The dignity of superiors entails duties. *Keine Wuerde ohne Buerde.* These duties are not expressed, but assumed, in the Fourth Commandment, which is addressed only to inferiors or subjects. However, the obligations of superiors deserve to be treated in connection with any exposition of the Ten Commandments. "In addition, it would not be amiss to preach to the parents, and such as bear their office, as to how they should deport themselves toward those who are committed to them for their government. For although this is not expressed in the Ten Commandments, it is nevertheless abundantly enjoined in many places in the Scriptures. And God desires to have it embraced in this commandment when He speaks of father and mother. For He does not wish to have in this office and government knaves and tyrants; nor does He assign to them this honor, *viz.*, power and authority to govern, and to allow themselves to be worshiped; but they should consider that they are under obligations of obedience to God, and that first of all they are earnestly and faithfully to discharge the duties of their office. . . . Therefore do not think that this is appointed for thy pleasure and arbitrary will, but that it is a strict command and institution of God, to whom also thou must give account of the matter." (L. C., 414.)

If our superiors are what God wants them to be, a favorable condition is created for their subjects being what they ought to be. In its proverbial sayings the world has recognized the connection of cause and effect between the quality of leaders and that of subordinates: Like father, like son; like king,

3) As when the doyen of any profession is called "father."

like people; like shepherd, like sheep. Luther has, in his Table of Duties, offered valuable aids for a fruitful discussion of the obligations of superiors.

1. The duties of parents: Table of Duties, No. 7.

a. Children derive from their parents both their body and their soul. Natural instinct impels parents to provide for the physical needs of their children, food, clothing, shelter, and attention in sickness. Christianity does not destroy, but ennable this natural instinct. Therefore Paul, 1 Tim. 5, 8, charges parents who do not provide for those of their household with having abjured their faith. *Fides non tollit officia naturalia, sed perficit et firmat.* (Bengel.) *Pronoein* in this text embraces every form of that provident care which is such a great factor in our home-life: industry, thrift, economy, temperate and regular habits, all of which create a healthy atmosphere for the growing child, in which its physical and mental powers are developed.

b. But the parents' greatest concern relates to their children's souls. Eph. 6, 4 states two distinct duties of parents in this respect:

aa. The negative duty: "Provoke not your children to wrath," "by injustice, harshness, hastiness of temper, undue severity, and the like, whereby the children are irritated against the fathers; in Col. 3, 21 there is subjoined as motive, 'lest they be discouraged.'" (Meyer.) The presence of children in a home must act as a check upon the passions of the parents. Calm, considerate, even-tempered should be the speech and actions of parents before their children; else how shall the children perceive the "hidden majesty" in their parents?

bb. The positive duty: "Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." *Ektrephein*, in v. 29, means to "nourish," to provide food; but here it signifies spiritual nurture; for it is to be done by means of *paideia kai nouthesia Kyriou*. "En denotes the regulative element in which the training is to take place. Hence: in the Lord's training and correction. *Paideia* is the general term, the training of children as a whole, and *nouthesia*⁴⁾ is the special one, the reproof aiming at amendment, whether this admonition take place by means of words or of actual punishments. . . . *Kyriou* means neither to the Lord, nor according to the doctrine of Christ, nor worthily of the Lord;⁵⁾ but it is the subjective genitive, so that the Lord Himself is conceived as exercising the training and reproof, in so far namely as Christ by His Spirit impels and governs the fathers

4) *lit.*, "setting the mind right."

5) All these meanings are, however, embraced in the aims of Christian child-training.

therein." (*Meyer.*) "This is a sad evil that . . . all live on as though God gave us children for our pleasure or amusement." (*L. C.*, 414.) "God could easily make men, yea, children of Abraham, out of stones and wood, as St. John the Baptist says, Matt. 3, 9; but He prefers that they should come from other men. Therefore He creates children for us, and commands them to obey their parents, and us, to bring them up and treat them well. For of what use would we be to God if we would not do this? He has so thoroughly grafted the children into us that He spins them out of our own flesh and blood, not out of stone or wood, to the end that the honor and obedience of children towards their parents, and the care, toil, and great industry of parents for their children should be rendered more cordially and willingly. Now, if we do not well govern, train, and teach the children that come out of our own flesh and blood, how would we take care of them if they came out of stone or wood? Accordingly, let parents have a care that they govern their children well, as God has commanded, and let them soon do what is necessary, while the children can still be trained, bent, and guided. Let them not wait till the children are grown and have become hardened in self-will, or until they come under the rule of other people. You need not imagine that strange children are so near people's hearts as their own; it may happen occasionally, but it is a rare occurrence; out of a hundred strange children there is hardly one that is as cordially received as one's own offspring. . . . When children are disobedient and unruly, there is greater fault and defect in the parents than in the children. For the parents are negligent; they do not apply themselves with zeal to their children. Such parents are not worthy to succeed in raising children. . . . They may, indeed, love and train their children after the fashion of this world, and teach them how to fit into the world; but there is no one to rightly instruct and teach their souls in the fear of God. You can understand the people's mind in this matter by observing what kind of schools they are maintaining throughout the country. There is no one to teach his children to pray as they should, or to know the things that pertain to their salvation. Nor is any one willing to be at some expense, in order to have others train, teach, and instruct his children.—There are animals that eat their young and destroy their offspring. Such are those people who do not teach and instruct their children. Yea, there is not an animal on earth that is so hard-hearted toward its young as man, if the soul is drawn into the calculation. Hence, parents would deserve that God should take their children from them, if He were not so kind and did not protect the parents against their children, lest they strike

them on the head, or kill them, for having given them so little attention and not having taught and instructed them." (3, 1107 f.) "Father and mother can earn either heaven or hell by their good or evil rule over their children." (3, 1096. 1109.) — Valuable material on this subject is found in Luther's *Sermon on the Duty of Parents to Send Their Children to School.* (10, 416—459.)

cc. Parental government is a requisite for the well-being of every other estate in the world. "If obedience is not rendered at the homes, we shall never succeed in governing an entire city, country, principality, or kingdom. For there is the primary government, whence every other government and rule takes its origin. If the stock is not good, no good tree and fruit can grow from it. For what else is a city than a collection of homes? How is an entire city to be well governed if there is no government in the homes, and neither the children nor the servants obey? Likewise, what is an entire country but a multitude of cities, towns, and villages? If the homes are badly ruled, how can the entire country be ruled well? Yea, the result will be nothing but tyranny, sorcery, murder, theft, unruly conduct. For a principality is a number of estates and counties, a kingdom comprises a number of principalities, an empire a number of kingdoms. All these grow out of single homes. Now, if father and mother do not rule well, no city, town, or village, no estate, principality, kingdom, or empire can have a good and peaceable government. For the son grows up to be the head of a family, a judge, burgomaster, duke, king, emperor, preacher, schoolmaster, etc. If he has been badly raised, the subjects will be like their lord, the members like the head." (3, 1106.) "Fathers and mothers are bishops, popes, doctors, emperors, princes, and lords in their homes. Accordingly, a father must punish his child like a judge, teach him like a doctor, preach to him like a parson or bishop. If he does this, he will pass muster before God; if not, he will receive his due from God." (3, 1109.)

2. The duties of masters and mistresses: Table of Duties No. 10. Eph. 6, 9, while still recognizing the inequality of rank between masters and servants, which had been impressed on the servants in vv. 5—8, impresses on the masters a twofold *moral equality*:

a. *Ta auta poieite pros autous* refers back to the sincerity and the good will which has been enjoined in vv. 5 and 7. The law of fairness demands that masters should be upright, honest, not practising duplicity, and that they should be of a well-meaning disposition in their dealings with servants; for so they want their servants to be. It is a poor rule that does not apply both ways, and moral precepts are fair to all concerned. The master is to regard his servant as

a valuable asset for the accomplishment of his purposes; he cannot do his work well if he spoils a fine tool with which he must work; and he will have his servant against him, if he acts the hypocrite and becomes harsh and cruel to the servant. — The *eunoia*, the kindly disposition which he must cherish toward the servant, should show itself in this manner that he "forbears threatening." *Apeilen* with the article means the intimidating methods commonly employed by task-masters. Such a practise the master is to "let go" entirely. *Anientes* has been weakened by the translation "abating." The apostle would have the terrorism of masters not only reduced, but completely stopped. "This is again a sad evil, that all live on as though God gave us servants that we should employ them like a cow or ass, only for work, or as though all we had to do with our subjects were only to gratify our wantonness, without any concern on our part as to what they learn or how they live." (L. C., 414.)

b. The thought of the future retribution must be kept alive in masters. That thought will have a humbling effect. In v. 5 the apostle had declared that masters are such only *kata sarka*, according to the outward position which they temporarily occupy in life. Now he reminds them that they are on the same plane with their servants before Him who is also their Master, and who is called "the Lord of lords." With Him there is no *prosopolepsia*: He is not partial to rank and station. "At the Judgment He will, without partiality, alike sustain the injured rights of the slaves, and punish the unchristian threatening of the masters, which instead of operating by moral means, only terrifies by rude authority." (Meyer, who here quotes Seneca, *Thyest.* 607: "Ye to whom the ruler of sea and earth has entrusted the great right of life and death, dismiss your elated and arrogant looks. Whatever an inferior dreads from you, that a master greater than you threatens. Every sovereignty is beneath a sovereignty still more severe.")⁶⁾

3. On the duties of pedagogs in schools Luther has no special Table of Duties, because the schools in his day were all church schools, conducted on a religious basis by Christian teachers. Much of what he has put into the first Table of Duties applies to teachers. His *Admonition to the Counselors of All Cities of Germany to Establish*

6) *Vos, quibus rector maris atque terrae
Jus dedit magnum necis atque vitae,
Ponite inflatos tumidosque vultus.
Quicquid a vobis minor extimescit,
Major hoc vobis dominus minatur;
Omne sub regno graviore regnum est.*

and Maintain Christian Schools (10, 458—485) abounds in sound advice to schoolteachers. “As the best and most useful teachers, and the cream of their profession, we should regard those who can well inculcate the Catechism, that is, who can correctly teach the Lord’s Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Creed. These are rare birds. There is no great glory and show in their work, but it is very useful. Theirs is the most necessary preaching, because it is a brief summary of the entire Scriptures. There is not a single Gospel-lesson from which these things might not be taught, if we would only do it and take the trouble of teaching the poor common people.” (14, 1771.) “A wicked teacher misapplies his science, his keen understanding, his knowledge of languages, and other endowments, only for his own profit.” (6, 398.)

4. The duties of civil governors Luther finds stated in Rom. 13, 1—4. (Table of Duties No. 3.)

a. Three times in close succession Paul declares: that a magistrate is a minister of God (*Theou diakonos*, v. 4, *leitourgos Theou*, v. 6). “The thought in v. 4 that the magistracy is *Theou diakonos* is here, by way of climax, more precisely defined through *leitourgoi* (which is therefore prefixed with emphasis) according to the official sacredness of this relation of service, and that conformably to the Christian view of the magisterial calling. Accordingly, those who rule, in so far as they serve the divine counsel and will, and employ their strength and activity to this end, are to be regarded as persons whose administration has the character of a divinely consecrated sacrificial service, a priestly nature.” (Meyer.) Now, these words were written with reference to magistrates, who were Gentiles, not Christians. Even they are servants ministering to God, whether they realize it or not. They should, however, be conscious of the fact that they are the ministers of God, in order to perform their office well. Also pagan magistrates, when contemplating their authority over their fellow-men,— and what an awful authority it sometimes is!— must have a conception of the solemnity and high responsibility of their office.

b. Luther has not embodied v. 3 and v. 4a in his Table of Duties, evidently, because he held that the same truth is stated in v. 4b.— Magistrates have to do with the works (*erga*), not the intentions, of their subjects. They regulate the open conduct of citizens, not their minds.— They are appointed to be a terror to evil-doers, and for that reason they have been given the awful *jus vitae et necis*, the power over life and death, which used to be, and still is, symbolized by the sword which they wore at their side, and which was in solemn pro-

cession borne before them. This sword which the magistrate wears habitually (*phorei* is stronger than *pherei*) is not a personal ornament, an idle decoration, but by having been given the right to bear it the magistrate is become an executive of justice (*ekdikos*), unto wrath, that is, for making evil-doers feel the wrath of men whose sense of righteousness they have outraged. Accordingly, the magistrate who is loath to use his vindictive power, or is indifferent to its exercise, who connives at wrong-doing, or openly shields and defends wrong-doers, belies his sacred office, and becomes himself a worse criminal than those whom he ought to punish. On the other hand, the avenging power should not be taken away from magistrates by others. "Our passage proves (comp. Acts 25, 11) that the abolition of the right of capital punishment deprives the magistracy of a power which is not merely given to it in the Old Testament, but is also decisively confirmed in the New Testament, and which it (herein lies the sacred limitation and responsibility of this power) possesses as God's minister, on which account its application is to be upheld as a principle with reference to those cases at law where the actual satisfaction of the divine Nemesis absolutely demands it, while at the same time the right of pardon is still to be kept open for all concrete cases. The character of being unchristian, of barbarism, etc., does not adhere to the right itself, but to its abuse in legislation and practise." (Meyer.) — Magistrates are appointed, furthermore, for the encouragement and advancement of every good work. They should bestow praise, offer rewards, etc., for all enterprises that look to the common welfare. A government which is cold towards the zeal, devotion, progressiveness of its public-spirited citizens, or frowns upon them, or seeks to hinder or thwart them, is not doing what God wants it to do.

c. One of Luther's greatest writings, *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation regarding the Improvement of the Christian Estate* (10, 266—351; translated in Wace and Buchheim, *Luther's Primary Works*), relates to the duties of magistrates, whose office had been perverted through the power which the Roman Church at that time had over the secular government. It is for communities that were Christian and were to be liberated from unchristian influences that Luther wrote this treatise. That Luther cannot justly be charged with confounding Church and State we have tried to show in THEOL. QUART., July, 1914, pp. 176—179. See also the Theological Opinion rendered by Luther and Melanchthon to the Elector of Saxony, *Whether Judicial Decisions are to be Rendered according to Moses or according to the Imperial Code* (10, 352—359). Luther's opinion, in a nutshell, is: "Every judge is obliged to render his de-

cision in accordance with the laws of the country in which he lives. For while we were in subjection to Gentiles, we were amenable to their laws and jurisdiction. And this may be done with a good conscience, 1 Pet. 2, 13." (p. 356.)

5. The quality of our leaders (*hegoumenoi*) in the Church, Luther has shown by quotations from the Pastoral Epistles in his first Table of Duties.

a. Their duties are indicated in their very names of "bishops" (from *episkopoi*, overseers), "pastors" (from the Latin, which means shepherds), and "preachers" (from *praedicare*, to proclaim before one, like a herald). As bishops they must move among their flocks, frequently visiting their members, to observe their needs, and, having understood them, to be able to minister to them promptly and efficiently. As pastors they must provide for the nurture and guidance of the sheep of Christ jointly and severally, and defend them, even at the risk of their lives, against dangers. As preachers they must bring to their hearers the messages of God, ever careful not to speak anything except what God has declared in His Word, strictly conforming their teaching to "the faithful Word," that is, the word which can be relied upon, because it is God's Word; in a word, they must be orthodox. In order that their hearers may accept and enact the Word, they must exhort them, urging the lukewarm, the wavering, the indifferent, and overcome the counter arguments of unbelievers and the heterodox. Tit. 1, 9. In all these ways he is to show himself *didaktikos*, "one who possesses everything that fits him for teaching, including also the willingness. . . . The *Episkopos* in particular had to know how to handle doctrine, in instructing the catechumens, in building up the faith of the church, and in refuting heresies; hence Paul, in Eph. 4, 11, calls the *poimenes* (shepherds) of the church *didaskaloi* (teachers)." (Meyer.) — Heb. 13, 17 describes the work of these men as *agrypnein hyper ton psychon*, lit., "to be sleepless in behalf of souls," that is, to give oneself up wholly to ceaseless and intense work for the spiritual advancement and protection of the parishioner. And all this with a profound sense of accountability, *hos logon apodosontes*, as men who must give an account to God and the Lord at His return. The pastoral office is no sinecure; it cannot tolerate any "holy loafers," and men who have entered this calling with a view of obtaining an easy and pleasant livelihood have usually discovered their mistake soon. — Paul has called all their functions *kalon ergon*, a beautiful work: work, because it is not ease, leisure, but hard service (*negotium, non otium* — Bengel) that they find in their office; and beautiful, because it de-

mands noble virtues, excellent qualities, which reflect honor on the possessor who devotes them to his high profession, and thereby causes the profession to appear great and illustrious.

b. A good office must be committed to good men (*bonum negotium bonis committendum* — *Bengel*). The incumbent of this office must be blameless, *anepileptos*, that is, a person of whom no one can take hold with a just charge, “without crime, bad report, and just suspicion.” To this end he must possess and practise the virtues and shun the vices and improprieties which the apostle enumerates 1 Tim. 3, 2—6.

aa. He should be married. “Unmarried persons were then rare, nor does he exclude the latter from the sacred office, yet he assumes that the father of a family was somewhat better fitted for it, and that of two candidates, equal in other respects, he who has a wife and a virtuous family is preferable to a bachelor, who has less recommendation from that very fact, vv. 4.5; for he who is himself bound to the domestic duties, so often mentioned here, attracts more than those bound by similar ties to the world, and benefits the community by a more popular example, v. 4. Add to this that indiscriminate celibacy has exposed many to blame. The Jews also teach that a priest should be neither unmarried nor childless, lest he be unmerciful.” (*Bengel*)⁷

7) Meyer has a long *excursus* at this place, in which he refutes those who think that polygamy or a second marriage are forbidden to pastors. Polygamy is entirely out of the question, not only for pastors, but also for lay Christians. As to the notion that a second marriage is immoral, that arose in an age when asceticism became prevalent, and paved the way for celibacy. “There is good ground for taking the disputed expression (*mias gynaikos andra*) simply as opposed to an immoral life, especially to concubinage. What he says, then, is, that a bishop is to be a man who neither lives, nor has lived, in sexual intercourse with any other woman than the one to whom he is married. Thus interpreted, the apostle’s injunction is amply justified, not only in itself, but also in regard to the extraordinary laxness of living in his day, and it is in full harmony with the other injunctions.” Accordingly, Carlstadt was wrong when he argued from this text that pastors *must* marry. (4, 1988; 15, 2522 ff.) Likewise, Alford is wrong, who defends a view prevalent in the Episcopal Church, saying: “It is impossible to understand this as a *command* to be the husband of one wife, as Bengel does. [!] The most natural view is that it forbids a second marriage to elders (bishops) in the Church.” That Bengel is innocent of the teaching with which he has been charged the words cited above show.—How does Roman exegesis square itself to this text? Either it admits that marriages of priests are here sanctioned and desired, and then claims that the exigencies

— Corresponding to this is what the apostle says in v. 4 about the well-regulated home of the pastor. "Many men are mild abroad, but restrain their passion the less at home, directing it against their wives," etc. (*Bengel*) "The bishop is to preside over his house in such a way that the children shall not be wanting" in *semnotes*, that is, submissiveness, and reverential behavior, not like Eli's sons. (*Meyer*.)

bb. Other qualities of the pastor which have a bearing on the respect which he is to receive are: he must be *nepharios*, "not enchanted nor intoxicated by any fleshly passion, watchful, not given to slumbering and sloth"; hence, sober in spirit. He must be *sophron*, "self-controlled," not yielding to impetuosity of mind, which sins in excess. The external manifestation of this quality makes the pastor *kosmios*, well-behaved, gentlemanly, and *philoxenos*, kind to strangers, hence hospitable, "especially to needy and exiled Christian brethren." These positive statements the apostle follows up with a number of negative ones: The pastor must be *me paroinos*, a person who is always near wine, a habitual drinker of spirituous liquors, hence a drunkard, in whom people will also behold the common effects of this vice, loss of the sense of decency and shame, rudeness, and arrogance. Nor must he be *plektes*, "a passionate man; who is inclined to come to blows, or utter words that hurt"; nor *aischrokerdes*,⁸⁾ shamefully mercenary. On the contrary, he should be *epieikes*, gentle, always bent on doing what is seemly; *amachos*, not a lover of battles, peaceful; *aphilargyros*, not a lover of money, free from avarice; *me neophytos*, "not recently converted from heathenism. Such might be more easily and safely set over new converts, Acts 14, 23, than over veteran Christians, who were numerous, and among whom were more candidates for the ministry. The metaphor is taken from plants, John 15, 2. The young plants generally exhibit a luxuriant verdure; the new convert has not yet been humbled by the cross. In every kind of life it may be observed that those who immediately begin at the highest elevation can hardly consult their own advantage, scarcely condescend to inferiors, cannot be moved by the condition of the afflicted, and cannot rule themselves, and maintain moderation in all things; but all these qualities particularly become the office of a bishop." (*Bengel, Stendel, Meyer*.)

of later times compelled a deviation from the original custom — which, of course, is not interpreting the text, but teaching canon law and re-

(*Latin* history; or it says *gave* in this text signifies the Church. (i)

8) The Revised Version omits this, because it is not found in the best MSS.

6. The qualities which God requires in aged men can be shown by the character of such patriarchs as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and others, like Barzillai, Paul the apostle, Anna, and by texts like Job 12, 20; 15, 9, 10; 32, 9.

Every superior owes it to the subjects committed to his care to commend his government to them by a conscientious performance of his own duties. His defaults will not excuse, but they will very often explain, the defaults of those placed under him. "As every one complains, the course of the world now is such that both young and old are altogether dissolute and beyond control, have no modesty nor sense of honor, do nothing good, except as they are driven to it by blows, and perpetrate what wrong and detraction they can behind each other's back; therefore God also punishes them, that they sink into all kinds of indecency and misery. Thus the parents themselves commonly are stupid and ignorant; one fool begets another, and as they have lived, so live their children after them." (L. C., 408.)

II. Sins Committed against Our Superiors. Qu. 41, 42.

Insubordination would be the word to express comprehensively the sins against the Fourth Commandment. Insubordination is the refusal to recognize and adapt oneself to the relation which God has ordained between rulers and their subjects. The sins against this commandment tend to the disruption of the three fundamental estates of the world: the home, the State, and the Church, hence, to the overthrow of social order.

1. The opposite of honor is contempt. Luther has, therefore, rightly described the sin against the Fourth Commandment by the two verbs "despise" and "provoke"; the former relates to the disposition of the heart, the latter to the expression of the contemptuous thoughts of the heart by gestures, words, and acts.

a. This sin starts with the loss of *phobos*, fear, in the subjects, 1 Pet. 2, 18, which "denotes the shrinking from transgressing the master's will, based on the consciousness of subjection, cf. Eph. 6, 5. Doubtless this shrinking is in the case of the Christian based on the fear of God; but the word *phobos* does not directly mean such fear, 'but the anxious regard which should animate the inferior in his dealings with his superior. *Pas phobos* is "every kind of fear; a fear wanting in nothing that goes to make up true fear." (Meyer.)

b. When the heart has divorced itself from the feeling of subjection to a master, it "despiseth to obey." *Bus like chat*, Prov. 30, 17, literally means "to tread obeying under foot." The rebellious heart

disdains submission, and proceeds to show it by a "mocking eye." *Laag* means to stammer, and then, to imitate a stammerer for the purpose of derision. Next follow derisive remarks like those which Elisha heard from the boys of Bethel, 2 Kings 2, 23 f., and finally, actual resistance (*antitassesthai*, Rom. 13, 2), as when Eli's sons rudely set aside the remonstrances of their father, 1 Sam. 2, 12, or when Absalom proceeded to dethrone his father and his king, 2 Sam. 15.

c. These acts "provoke anger": they anger God, who curses the disobedient, and has put dire threats against the disobedient into His holy Book, Prov. 30, 17; Rom. 13, 2; and they rouse the anger of superiors in whose heart God has placed a sense of their dignity, and to whom He has given the authority to punish the rebellious.

d. Accordingly, what the Fourth Commandment forbids is, failing to respect the dignity of superiors, refusing to do their will, and disgracing them by wicked acts.

2. Insubordination occurs

a. at home, where the parental authority of either father or mother, or both, is set aside by unruly and wayward children, Prov. 30, 17, or the master's authority by servants, 1 Pet. 2, 18. The master may be *skolios*, conducting himself, not in a right, but in a perverse manner, dealing unjustly with his servants. But his perverseness is a fault which God has already marked, and for which the master will have to answer; it does not, however, justify disobedience on the part of the servants. Besides, this text assumes that also "good and gentle" masters are disobeyed. Hence the duty to obey must not be derived from the quality of the master, or the good pleasure of the servant, but from God, who says: This person has been placed over you; him you must obey; because I will that you shall. — "We must impress it upon the young that they should regard their parents in God's stead, and remember that, however lowly, poor, frail, and queer they may be, nevertheless they are father and mother, given them by God. And they are not to be deprived of their honor because of their mode of life or their failings. Therefore we are not to regard their persons, how they may be, but the will of God, who has thus appointed and ordained. In other respects we are, indeed, all alike in the eyes of God; but among us there must necessarily be such inequality and distinction with respect to order, and therefore God commands that you be careful to obey me as your father, and that I have the precedence." (L. C., 405 f.) — In Eph. 6, 6 Paul warns "servants, hired men, and laborers" (Table of Duties No. 9) against a sin common among them which he calls *ophthalmodoulia*, "eye-

service." By such service they become *anthropareskoi*, "men-pleasers." "It is the service rendered to the eyes of the master, but in which the aim is merely to acquire the semblance of fidelity, inasmuch as one makes himself thus noticeable when seen by the master, but is in reality not such, acting, on the contrary, otherwise when his back is turned." Such servants see in their masters only *men*, and do their work for mere *human* approbation. They do not see that the will of Christ has fixed their relation to their masters; that this service terminates at their master's death, who was over them only *kata sarka*, or at their own death when they go to face their supreme Master; and hence their service is not rendered *meta phobou kai tromou*, with that keen apprehension of a servant who is afraid that he has not done enough; nor is it done *en haploteti tes kardias*; it is a hypo-critical service, full of duplicity in disposition and act." (Meyer.)

b. The insubordination of subjects is called *antitassesthai*, "resisting," Rom. 13, 2, and is described in Table of Duties No. 4 as a refusal to render to the government its due honor and support. Sedition, mutiny, rebellion, revolution, are terms for describing this sin. Nobody denies that public disturbances of this sort have sprung from the unrestrained passions of anarchists in principle or anarchists *de facto*; it is also admitted that they have, as a rule, been accompanied by excesses, and that the peaceable revolution is still less rare than the "friendly suit" at court. But a question of moment to Christian consciences is whether the Bible, f. i., in Rom. 13, 2, forbids revolutions. It has been observed in the preceding remarks that the apostle in this text refers to a *de facto* government of a tyrannical character, and yet urges submission, not as an expediency, not as a policy,— the Christians were branded as disloyal to the state and as secretly plotting against the government,— but as a religious principle. "From this point of view the Christian obeys not the human caprice and injustice, but the will of God, who—in connection with His plan of government inaccessible to human insight—has presented even the unworthy and unrighteous ruler as the *ousa exousia*, and has made him the instrument of his measures. Questions as to special cases—such as how the Christian is to conduct himself in political catastrophes, what magistracy he is to look upon in such times as the *ousa exousia*, as also, how he, if the command of the magistrate is against the command of God, is at any rate to obey God rather than men (Acts 5, 29), etc.—Paul here leaves unnoticed, and only gives the main injunction of obedience, which he does not make contingent on this or that form of constitution." So Meyer. His American editor, Timothy Dwight, adds: "Hai de ousai

refers to the then existing authorities, but suggests the same thing as relating to all times and places. Civil government is ordained of God. It should be recognized and obeyed by the subject of it as divinely instituted. The apostle is not discoursing or philosophizing on civil government, however, as if for the sole purpose of unfolding its true theory. He is in the midst of practical exhortations which bear upon the daily living of his readers. Consequently he moves in his expressions within the sphere of their life, calling attention to the actual magistrates under whom they were placed, to the functions which these magistrates exercised, to the powers which they possessed, to the duties and obligations owed to them, to the evil of resisting their authority. What he says, accordingly, is to be interpreted (and to receive its proper limitations also) in view of this fact. The opinion entertained by some writers that he denies here the right of revolution is entirely without foundation. There is no reference to this subject in this passage. This right, if it exists, under any circumstances, is like that of self-defense, and the discussion of the question of its existence is altogether outside of the sphere of his present thought." This we regard as a correct exhibition of the apostle's immediate thought in this passage. The "right of revolution" has nowhere been codified, and cannot be profitably debated in the abstract. Each revolution, just as each war, and each act of self-defense will have to be decided on its own merit with a proper regard for all attending circumstances. The Christian must always hold to this rule, that he may suffer wrong, but never do wrong. If he has to resist his government, he must show a divine reason for his resistance, *Acts 5, 29*. That a government whose acts defeat the very ends for which it has been instituted may be removed and replaced by another no Christian denies. The question only is to what extent he may become instrumental in such an event, and that question must be settled locally and temporally in each instance. Luther has explained the careful conduct of a Christian in regard to this matter in his *Faithful Admonition to All Christians to Avoid Tumult and Rebellion*. (10, 370 f.) — Under this head belongs also the disrespect shown the magistrates by subjects. Our political campaigns are frequently filled with slander: the persons holding office are treated as dishonest, those without office seeking to appear as the honest people, and elections are for the purpose of "turning the rascals out." Wanton criticism and contempt of the government, too, in the discharge of its functions is rampant. These practises are defended as the exercise of the right of free speech and unlimited debate; but that is not infrequently only a cloak for malicious intent. A Christian soils his conscience by participating in these practises.

c. The insubordination of pupils at school is not illustrated by a special text in our Catechism or in the Table of Duties, for the reason already indicated. It is treated in connection with the next subdivision. — The spirit of emancipation which has manifested itself in many ways in our modern social life has long ago entered also the schoolroom and lessened sadly the respect which pupils should have for their teachers. Not only is the good work of education hampered by the diminution of the teacher's authority, but young consciences are loading themselves with an early burden of guilt by their refractoriness, sullenness, and open and concealed acts by which they set the will of their teachers at naught.

d. The sins from which ministers of the Word are made to suffer are indicated in Heb. 13, 17 and in Table of Duties No. 2.

aa. God warns the members of the Church not to let their leaders be sighing, *me stenazontes*, namely, over the intraetableness and lack of docility with which they meet from their members. These are the usual forms in which disobedience and insubmissiveness of church-members are revealed.

bb. A very common cause of grief to pastors, preachers, teachers of the Word is the unwillingness of their members to provide their support. Gal. 6, 6, 7 has been noted in a different connection in our exposition of the Second and Third Commandments. The Table of Duties No. 2 introduces it once more in outlining the duties of church-members towards their pastors and teachers. "God is not mocked," *mykterizetai*. Bengel calls attention to the fact that the verb is in the middle voice; he paraphrases the text thus: "God does not permit empty promises to be made to Him. The expression, which is by no means common, seems to allude to the Septuagint, and indeed to Prov. 12, 8: *nothrokardios mykterizetai*, 'the slow of heart is despised' (Engl. Vers.: 'he that is of a perverse heart'), so that the meaning is, God is not *nothrokardios*, 'slow of understanding,' but judges truly, and is not silent forever, Ps. 50, 21. They endeavor to mock Him who think thus: I will sow to the flesh, and yet persuade God to give me the harvest of life." "Every one withholds and makes objections, and all are afraid that they will perish from bodily want, and therefore cannot now support a respectable preacher, where formerly they filled ten gormandizers. In this we also deserve that God deprive us of His Word and blessing, and again allow preachers of lies to arise to lead us to the devil, and, in addition, to drain our sweat and blood." (L. C., 413.)

e. The young in general (Table of Duties No. 11) are warned in this commandment against the sin of pride. The conceit of youth

is proverbial. Young people forget that the present in which they live is the fruit of patient labors performed by others in the past, and that they themselves are, to a large extent, not producers, but consumers. In their callow and shallow minds the true value of things and the connection between causes and effects is hardly ever correctly estimated. As a rule, they "know better" than the "old folks," and override the warnings and objections of their seniors.

3. Insubordination is visited by God with dire retribution, here and hereafter.

a. Disobedient children are told *Prov. 30, 17* that they will ultimately become carrion for birds; they will be strangled as menaces to society when they have run their course to the bitter end, and their bodies will be left unburied. "If you offend Him, He will send upon you death and the torturer. Whence come so many criminals that must daily be hanged, beheaded, broken upon the wheel, but from disobedience to parents, because they will not submit to discipline in good part? And the result is, since they are unwilling to hear the reproof of parents given in kindness and love, that, by the punishment of God, they bring upon themselves misfortune and grief. For it seldom happens that such wicked people die a natural or timely death." (*L. C., 410.*) "Whoever will not be influenced by this and inclined to piety we leave to the hangman and to death." (*L. C., 412.*) In the case of those sons of Belial, Hophni and Phinehas, we have an example how God visits both on children and parents infractions of the Fourth Commandment.

b. Rebels are told. *Rom. 13, 2*, that they "shall receive to themselves damnation," *krima*, that is, a penal judgment here, which may be the preamble of the eternal judgment. It was this reflection which made David's grief over the death of Absalom, *2 Sam. 15*, so keen and bitter. If a person "despises and resists authority or rebels, let him know that he shall have no favor or blessing, and when he thinks to gain a florin thereby, he will elsewhere lose ten times as much, or become a victim to the hangman, perish by war, pestilence, and famine, or experience no good in his children, and be obliged to suffer injury, injustice, and violence at the hands of his servants, neighbors, or strangers and tyrants." (*L. C., 412.*)

c. The scornful conduct of the youths at Bethel, *2 Kings 2, 24 f.*, was directed not so much against the person of Elisha as rather against his office as a prophet of God. It was Elisha's first appearance at Bethel, after his appointment as successor to Elijah. A crowd of youths appears to have banded themselves together to vent their spite against the priestly profession, which was particularly prominent at

this place because a school of the prophets had been established there. It is likely that these youths had been reared in irreverence, rudeness, and unbelief by their ungodly parents, and that their insulting remarks were the twitter which these young birds had learned from the older birds at their homes. Elisha could not have allowed their unbecoming action to go unrebuked without denying his holy calling. His cursing, however, was "no vulgar, rude cursing from ill temper and anger, no misuse of the holy name of God, but the correct use of this name, threatening with divine punishment those who, in the prophet, treated with contumely Him who sent the prophet. The punishment itself Elisha left to Him who ever judges rightly, and whom no one may ask, Lord, what doest Thou? As Elisha was not silent, so also now a faithful servant of the Lord may not keep silent if young people are brought up badly and godlessly; he ought not to let pass unnoticed their wickedness and impudence, and their contempt for that which is holy. It is his duty to warn them and their parents of the divine punishment. Woe to the watchmen who are dumb watchdogs, who cannot punish, who are lazy, and who are glad to lie and sleep!" (Krummacher, in *Schaff-Lange Commentary, ad locum.*)

III. The Proper Treatment of Our Superiors. Qu. 43. 44.

A. From the commandment proper Luther has transferred to his explanation the idea of honor, but has expanded it into its true meaning: "in Ehren halten." The English "give them honor" is not an adequate rendering either of Luther's words or thought, which rather means "to regard them habitually and constantly as being objects that deserve to be honored."

1. This expansion is justified by the fact that the commandment lays down a rule for the entire life of those to whom it is addressed. It demands of inferiors not occasional expressions of reverence and homage, but an attitude of the mind, the heart, the affections, which continuously faces the superiors with awe and respect.

2. The true reason why superiors should be honored is that they are "God's representatives." This fact has been established sufficiently in Part I.

B. The two next acts which Luther mentions as parts of the proper treatment of our superiors are practical expressions of the honor in which they should be held. "Serve and obey" are really a compound term; for neither is service acceptable

if it does not flow from obedience, nor can obedience be truly rendered without active service.

1. Thus obedience is rendered by "hearkening unto," Prov. 23, 22, and by "submitting oneself," Heb. 13, 17. Obedience, from the Latin *obaudire*, is, literally, "hearkening unto," that is, listening to an order or wish, and then proceeding to carry it out.

2. The duty of serving obedience suffers a limitation that is, indeed, self-evident, but, because of the perplexities which it creates, deserves to be noted specially. As the authority of our human superiors is secondary to that authority from which it is derived, God's, obedience rendered to men must never be at the sacrifice of the faithful primary and absolute obedience which God requires for Himself. When the apostles declared: *Peitharchein dei Theo mallon e anthropois*, Acts 5, 29, they applied this limitation to a tyrannical and unwarranted ordinance of the representatives of the theocracy at Jerusalem.— This limitation is implied in Rom. 13: when Paul derives the powers of established governments from God, he posits the metes and bounds of the authority of the State at the declared will of God; for it is inconceivable that God would grant to any one the authority to supersede Himself. It is to be regretted that our Catechism nowhere cites Matt. 22, 21 among its 54⁸ proof-texts. This text, which teaches so plainly and so forcefully the separation of Church and State, and declares the mind of our Lord and Savior on a matter that is ever dear to the heart of every Lutheran and American, may be properly inserted at this place.— The limitation is again implied in Col. 3, 20, where neither Luther's⁹⁾ nor the English translation brings out the true force of *en Kyrio*, which is to be understood in the same manner as in v. 18, as denoting Christian character, in which, and as proceeding from which, the disciples whom Paul addresses are to perform whatever they do. Thus the sweeping *kata pantα* in this text is seen not to imply absolute obedience. They could never expect to please Christ by doing the opposite of what Christ had taught them, and no appeal to the obedience which they owed Caesar would avail them at the tribunal of Jesus, who placed God above Caesar. That Christian martyrdom which makes the supreme sacrifice arises— and in fact can only arise— on the occasion when the powers that be clash with the Power that was, and is, and ever shall be. The *dei* in Acts 5, 29 makes such a martyrdom

9) Luther rendered from the Elzevir text, which has dropped the *en* as "apparently superfluous." Possibly the translators of the King James Version rendered from the same text.

a sad, but still a glorious act of obedience. When this necessity arises in a given instance, must be established from the attending circumstances; there is also a false martyrdom, which arises from ignorance or conceit. Beyond explaining the general principle expressed in Acts 5, 29, the catechist should not attempt to settle cases in casuistry beforehand.

C. The last act which Luther mentions as belonging to the honor due our superiors flows from a consideration of the blessings desired from them. "Lieb und wert haben" implies an evaluation; and it is proper, yea, necessary, that every inferior reflect frequently what his condition in life would be without his masters. He will thus "learn, first, what is the honor towards parents required by this commandment, *viz.*, first, that they be . . . esteemed above all things, as the most precious treasure on earth." This evaluation will naturally affect also the service and obedience rendered them, so "that, secondly, in our words to them we observe modesty, and do not speak roughly, haughtily, and defiantly, but yield to them in silence, even though they go too far. Thirdly, also, with respect to works, that we show them such honor, with body and possessions, as to serve them, help them, and provide for them when old, sick, infirm, or poor, and all that not only gladly, but with humility and reverence, as doing it before God. For he who knows how to regard them in his heart will not allow them to suffer hunger and want, but will place them above and near him, and will share with them whatever he has and can obtain." (L.C., 406.)

D. This citation from Luther already applies the general duties just noted to

1. The particular sphere of the home, where all virtuous conduct (1 Tim. 5, 4: "learn first to show piety at home")¹⁰⁾ starts. Prov. 23, 22 ought to quicken the memory of a son or daughter with recollections of that most unselfish service which was rendered him or her by a father's and mother's love in their puny infancy and defenseless childhood. But for our parents "we should rot in our

10) These words are not cited in the text as printed in our Catechism; their usefulness in a catechization is apparent.

dirt" (3, 1094; *L. C.*, 409), and grow up as savages. This text, moreover, mentions both father and mother separately, yet together as equally entitled to the child's esteem. Sometimes the father is differentiated against in this respect in favor of the mother,—a very common popular sentiment in our day!—sometimes the case is reversed. But in an age when polygamy was tolerated even among God's people, there was a special reason why reverence for the mother should be inculcated.—The respect due the parents is in this text plainly based on the fact of the child's descent from them. No conditions in the life of either the parents or the child at a later time can alter this fact.—1 Tim. 5, 4 speaks of the relation of *progonoi*, sires, ancestors, and *ekgona*, descendants, hence is more general in scope than the preceding text. As regards the peculiar duty which the apostle inculcates by *amoibas apodidonai*, "to recompense," it is a point contested among exegetes whether the apostle meant to teach what the text is cited as teaching. Meyer, we think, is correct in pointing to the context: the widows, of whom the apostle is here speaking, by the pious care for their children and grandchildren, are to recompense the love shown to themselves by their parents. Nevertheless, this explanation includes the general idea of recompense in any form for any service rendered, and there is no reason why the apostle should have enjoined requital for the training received from one's parents by a continuation of that training in one's own children rather than by any other means or method. Active gratitude is a law of the Christian religion.

2. In this connection the virtues of Christian domestics and laborers should be extolled. (Table of Duties No. 9.) Their service is valued when it is rendered *en haploteti tes kardias*, that is, when they have their heart fixed with a single purpose on doing the work assigned to the best of their ability. This requires strict honesty and a tender conscience: they are to do whatever they do *ek psyches*, "*ex animo*, from a genuine impulse of the heart" (Meyer) and *met' eunoias*, with a well-meaning disposition. They are to seek their glory in serving their masters well. And this they will do when they put Christ into their work, and regard themselves as His servants, bent upon "doing God's will," and "doing service as unto the Lord," while they are executing the orders of their human masters. Even if they were slaves, the nobility of their motives would shed a luster upon their most menial tasks: they would serve as free men even in their state of bondage. Keble rightly sings concerning the Christian maid-servant who sweeps a room for the Lord's sake: "Makes that and the action fine." Man-servants and maid-servants "ought rather

to pay wages in addition and be glad that they may obtain masters and mistresses, to have such joyful consciences and to know how they may do truly golden works; a matter which has hitherto been neglected, and despised, when, instead, everybody ran, in the devil's name, into convents or pilgrimages and for indulgences, with loss of time and money and with an evil conscience. If, indeed, this truth could be impressed upon the poor people, a servant-girl would leap and thank and praise God, and with her menial work, for which she receives support and wages, she would acquire a treasure such as all that are esteemed the greatest saints have not obtained. Is it not an excellent boast to know and say this, that if you perform your daily domestic task, it is better than all the ascetic life and sanctity of monks?" (*L. C.*, 411.)

3. The duties of subjects to their government are comprehensively stated in Matt. 22, 21 (Table of Duties No. 4): *Apodote ta kaisaros kaisari*. "By the *ta kaisaros* we are not to understand merely the civil tax, but everything to which Caesar was entitled in virtue of his legitimate rule." The context, moreover, shows that our Lord meant to teach His cunning inquirers that no worshiper of God can compromise his religious faith if he discharges his political obligations. He would sin by surrendering to Caesar the affairs of his heart and conscience, over which God rules supremely; but he would likewise sin by not yielding to Caesar his entire physical life and earthly estate which he holds under the protection of Caesar. — The statement of Christ is unfolded in detail by means of Rom. 13, 6, 7, where the apostle summarizes practical duties of the citizen, and tells the Romans that, in general, they must render to all magisterial persons their due, and, in particular, to tax officers, customs officers, judicial and other functionaries of the State the peculiar duty and deference which their office requires. — In 1 Tim. 2, 2 the apostle enjoins upon Christians prayer for the *basileis*, that is, the highest authorities in the State, and their deputies, all who hold the office of magistrate anywhere (the same distinction occurs in 1 Pet. 2, 14). "The prayer is . . . not for the conversion of the heathen rulers, but for the divine blessing necessary to them in the discharge of their office." (Meyer.) The old Christian liturgies show that this injunction of the apostle was literally carried out. — All this service is to be rendered *dia ten syneidesin*, on account of the persons' conscience, Rom. 13, 5; "for the Lord's sake," 1 Pet. 2, 13. With the Christian citizen loyalty to the existing government, even to a pagan government, is a religious sentiment, a principle of faith, a divine duty. Melanchthon was right when he wrote: "No human power, no armies can better fortify states

than this most solemn law of God: You must obey for conscience' sake."

4. The proper treatment of our superiors in school and church requires that we recognize them as "leaders." This is the best rendering of *hegoumenoi* in Heb. 13, 17. This is stated still more plainly in 1 Thess. 5, 12, when the apostle requires Christians *eidenai tous pro-histamenous*, to recognize those who are placed at the head, particularly for the purpose of directing the general and external concerns of the Church. We remarked in Part I that the relation of church-members to their pastors is a spiritual one. In reality, there is no human mastery in the Church; all are brethren; the pastors, theologians, laymen, are on the level of faith with one another before God, and on the level of mutual brotherly love in their relation to each other. The ministry in the Church is nothing but a service; it is not a spiritual preeminence. But God differentiates the ministrations of the various members of the Church, and He declares that pastors are His gifts, and that He endows them with the qualities necessary for their ministry. This unequal endowment in no way destroys, it rather helps to strengthen, the inward spiritual equality of the members of the Church; for the pastors recognize in their qualifications only calls to service, and the laymen rejoice in the efficient work that is being done for them.—This work is described as "laboring," *kopian*, 1 Thess. 5, 12; 1 Tim. 5, 17; as "watching over souls," *agrypnein hyper psychon*, Heb. 13, 17, that is, hard, painstaking work. In this work the pastors of the Church are to be regarded as accountable to the Lord, *hos logon apodosontes*, that is, as being under a solemn pledge to the Lord and the Church that they will faithfully and conscientiously discharge their work in season and out of season. All who perform this work are worthy of honor, and those who perform it well are "worthy of double honor," 1 Tim. 5, 17, and to be "esteemed very highly," 1 Thess. 5, 13. *Time* in the former passage may, but must not, mean "reward," and with *diplē* as a qualifier may, but must not, mean a salary twice as large as that which others get. The most natural meaning is that efficient service entitles the servant to superior recognition, which should not be withheld, because it, too, serves to make the servant labor "with joy and not with grief," Heb. 13, 17.—The words "and be at peace among yourselves," in 1 Thess. 5, 13, have no direct bearing on the matter under discussion. Indirectly, however, quarrelsomeness among the members of the Church, strife and envying and bitterness in which the members engage, despite the earnest warning and pleading of their pastor, is also a form of disrespect shown them; while peace and quiet in the con-

gregation reflect great credit on the pastor's work, under the grace of God. — When these greater duties are being complied with, the lesser, the pastor's support, is easy. It is to be noted that when congregations support their pastors and teachers, they are not dispensing charity, but rewarding their laborer, who is worthy of his hire, although he has not entered upon his calling for the sake of the hire, Luke 10, 7. God wants ministers to devote themselves to the work of the Gospel and to obtain their living from this work, 1 Cor. 9, 14. This text should be read together with the preceding verse, where the law regarding the support of the priesthood in the Old Testament is referred to. "Even so," the apostle continues in v. 14, the Lord Christ has ordained; where? in passages like Matt. 10, 10; Luke 10, 8. In these passages the Lord has made an order, *dictare*; it is not as minute as that of the Old Testament, but it is sufficient; it secures to the pastors eating and drinking, and a share in all good things which their parishioners possess, Luke 10, 7; Gal. 6, 6, and the sharing of which the parishioners do not begrudge their pastor, 1 Tim. 5, 18. The law regarding muzzling a threshing ox is in Deut. 25, 4. Wealthy congregations let their ministers share their wealth; poor congregations, their poverty; that is the New Testament rule "which the Lord ordained"; and this rule is quite fair to pastor and to people. "It is a true and good saying of old and wise men: *Deo, parentibus et magistris non potest satis gratiae rependi*, that is, To God, to parents, and to teachers we can never render sufficient gratitude and compensation." (L. C., 408.) "There is need that this also be urged upon the people that those who would be Christians are under obligation in the sight of God to esteem them worthy of double honor who minister to their souls, that they deal well with them and provide for them." (L. C., 413.)

5. What Lev. 19, 32 enjoins is a practical example of that humility which Table of Duties No. 11 declares the finest ornament of the young, for Peter wants to see the *neoteroi* "clothed with humility." It is a durable, homespun stuff which the silly youth in all ages have passed by with contempt; but some very great men have grown up in this cloth.

IV. *The Special Distinction of the Fourth Commandment.*

A. In Eph. 6, 2 Paul calls attention to the fact that the Fourth Commandment is *entole prole en epanggelia*. The apostle is speaking of all positive commandments which God has issued, not only of the Ten Commandments; for in that

there is a promise, attached to the First Commandment, which, however, is so general that it applies to the whole Decalog, leaving the Fourth Commandment in this group to be the *only* commandment with a promise. But in all the catalog of known expressions of the divine will the Fourth Commandment enjoys the distinction of being the first with a promise. "Although the rest also include their promises, yet in none is it so plainly and explicitly stated." (L. C., 409.)

B. The promise contains two distinct elements: prosperity and longevity, both temporal blessings, and hence subject to the dispensations of a conferring or withholding providence of God as may best suit the case of each individual. In honoring the obedient enactors of this law God honors this law and incites to its more general and thorough fulfilment, because its application ramifies to every phase of our earthly life, and makes that secure and enjoyable. In 1 Tim. 2, 2 "the quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty" is virtually a restatement of the promise attached to the Fourth Commandment.

C. This promise is hinted at in Col. 3, 20: "for this is well pleasing unto the Lord"; 1 Tim. 5, 4: "that is good and acceptable before God"; Heb. 13, 17 (*per contra*): "that is unprofitable for you"; 1 Tim. 2, 3: "this is good and acceptable in the sight of God, our Savior"; 1 Pet. 2, 14: "for the praise of them that do well"; Rom. 13, 3: "thou shalt have praise of the same"; Eph. 6, 8: "knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord"; 1 Pet. 5, 5: "giveth grace to the humble"; v. 6: "that He may exalt you in due time." Thus the promise with appropriate variations recurs in many passages addressed to men in all ranks and stations in this life.

D. History supplies the tests and evidences of the fulfilment: Joseph, Gen. 46, 47; Ruth, Book of Ruth 1, 16; Solomon, 1 Kings 2, 19; Jesus, Luke 2, 51. Luther has considered these promises such great inducements that, "if we had no father and mother, we ought to wish that God would set up wood and stone before us, that we might call them father and mother.

How much more, since He has given us living parents, should we rejoice to show them honor and obedience, because we know it is so highly pleasing to the Divine Majesty and to all angels, and vexes all devils, and is, besides, the highest work which we can do, after the sublime divine worship comprehended in the previous commandments, so that giving of alms and every other good work toward our neighbor are not equal to this. For God has assigned this estate the highest place, yea, in His own stead, upon earth. This will and pleasure of God ought to be sufficient to cause and induce us to do what we can with good will and pleasure." (*L. C.*, 408.) "Here, then, thou hast the fruit and the reward, *viz.*, that whoever observes this commandment shall have good days, happiness, and prosperity; and on the other hand also, the punishment that whosoever is disobedient shall the sooner perish, and never enjoy life. For to have long life in the sense of the Scriptures is not only to become old, but to have everything which belongs to long life, as, namely, health, wife and child, support, peace, good government, etc., without which this life can neither be enjoyed in cheerfulness nor long endure." (*L. C.*, 409.) "The godly and obedient have this blessing, that they live long in quietness, and see their children's children to the third and fourth generation. As experience also teaches that where there are honorable, old families who stand well and have many children, they have their origin in this fact, *viz.*, that some of them were well brought up and were regardful of their parents. So, on the other hand, it is written of the wicked (*Ps. 109, 13*): 'Let his posterity be cut off; and in the generation following let their name be blotted out.' Therefore consider well how great a thing in God's sight obedience is, since He so highly esteems it, is so highly pleased with it, and rewards it so richly, and, besides, is so rigid in punishing those who transgress with respect to it." (*L. C.*, 410.) "Those who keep in sight God's will and commandment have the promise that everything which they bestow upon temporal and spiritual fathers, and whatever they do to honor them, shall be richly recompensed to them, so that they shall have not only bread,

clothing, and money for a year or two, but long life, support and peace, and shall be eternally rich and blessed. Therefore only do what is your duty, and let God take care how He shall support you and provide you with abundance. Since He has promised it, and has never yet lied, He will not be found lying to you in this. This ought indeed to encourage us, and give us hearts that would melt in pleasure and love towards those to whom we owe this honor, so that we would raise our hands and joyfully thank God who has given us such promises, induced by which we ought to run to the ends of the world, to the remotest parts of India. For although the whole world should combine, it could not add an hour to our life or give us a single grain from the earth. But God wishes to give you all exceeding abundantly according to your heart's desire."

(*L. C.*, 414.)

Conclusion.—Are there any people who are fulfilling this commandment, and is there a way for us to fulfil it? "There must somewhere upon earth be still some godly people that God yet allows us so much good! On our own account we should neither have a farthing in the house nor a stalk of straw in the field." (*L. C.*, 413.) That is the genuine effect of the teaching of this commandment upon the conscience: a conviction for trespasses, a consciousness of guilt. The fulfilment is not to be expected from our natural ability under sin; for to fulfil this commandment properly the fear and love of God must first be in our hearts. These, however, enter our heart only as the fruits of the Spirit after our hearts have been renewed by grace through faith.

D.

LUTHER'S STRUGGLE IN BEHALF OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.*

In the Old Testament Church a jubilee was celebrated every fifty years, on which occasions all property was restored to its original owners. We are this year celebrating a jubilee to commemorate the great restoration of four hundred years ago, the restoration to the Church of its most precious possessions

* This discourse on *Heb.* 10, 19—22 was intended for the year of the jubilee, but its publication was unavoidably delayed.

D.

through Martin Luther. We are not alone in celebrating this event. All Protestant sects and many unbelievers are joining us in this festival. It is only fitting and proper that they should do this, for the whole world owes Luther a debt of gratitude which cannot be too highly estimated. It was Luther who first advocated schooling for the common people, and laid the foundation of our modern school system; it was Luther who broke the spell of medieval stagnation and hide-bound tradition, and became the champion of free thought, speech, and action; it was Luther who reestablished the correct view of the powers of government and Church, and made possible the Constitution of the United States. Every well-informed and thinking man must acknowledge this, even though he does not realize the full extent of the benefits conferred upon the world through Luther's reformation. Yea, even the Catholics of to-day, in spite of the slander and contumely which they heap upon Luther, are indebted to him for all the advantages which they enjoy over their medieval ancestors. A learned Catholic has said: "If Luther had not come, the bishops and priests would in the end have forced the people to devour hay like cattle." Practically all modern progress and enlightenment is due, directly or indirectly, to Luther and his work.

But that is not the cause for our rejoicing and thanksgiving. All these temporal benefits and advantages, grateful as we are for them, did not induce us to make this year of 1917 a festal year, a year of jubilee. No, we Lutherans, and all true Christians, have much greater cause for rejoicing. We celebrate the great spiritual gift which through Luther was bestowed upon us. For Luther opened the way to the Throne of Grace, reestablished filial relations between the sinner and God, and disclosed the everlasting love of the Father in Christ Jesus. That is the one great blessing of the Reformation, beside which all others pale into insignificance. And that is also the one great reason for our celebration: the reopening of the approach to the Throne of Grace through Martin Luther.

Free and unlimited bestowal of God's grace is the highest

privilege that we Christians enjoy. Direct communication with God, the right to approach Him at all times, not in fear, but in filial love and trust—what greater bliss and happiness could we desire? In the days of the old dispensation God's people did not enjoy such free access. Then only the high priest could enter the Holy of Holies to plead for the people and offer propitiation for their sins. But Christ came and made Himself the propitiation for the sins of the world, effecting a complete reconciliation between God and man. All obstacles were thus removed, and the way to the Throne of Grace was again open to all. The Christian no longer needed a priest to act for him. The Christians were themselves a royal priesthood. They were no longer strangers and foreigners, but of the household of God.

Surely no greater misfortune could befall the Christians than the loss of this privilege, and the obstruction and closing of the way to grace. This is just what happened under the papacy. The Pope could not, indeed, move God to change His mind, to rescind His promises. But he spread broadcast the belief that there was no free access, that the Old Testament style was still in force, that he and his priests must intercede with God for the people. But had not Christ said: "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden," and is not the Gospel full of such gracious invitations? How, then, could the Pope bar the way? To be sure, while the Gospel was preached, it was impossible for him to do so. But the wily Antichrist abolished the Gospel. Year after year, century after century, the bright light of the Gospel was dimmed, until finally it was completely hidden, and the Church had taken its place. The sinner could no longer approach God, no longer come unto Christ, but must fear Him as a stern and relentless Judge. The priest must negotiate between them, the Church, with its accumulated stores of holiness, with its sacrifice of the Mass, must intercede, must propitiate the angry Judge. The Church would do this only in return for implicit obedience on the part of its members. The priest had absolute power over the souls of men, and the sinner, in order to escape divine wrath, must

observe the mandates of his priest and bishop in all things. He must do penance for his sins, he must cry to the saints, above all, he must pay, much and often. Even though the people saw the loose and immoral life of the clergy, they had to submit themselves, for the latter held the power of life and death over them, and could with a word close the doors of heaven, and consign them to everlasting perdition. Thus did the priests tyrannize the poor souls, thus were the consciences bound to the Church. No one could be certain that his sins were forgiven, certain of a gracious God. Instead of seeking refuge with God against all enemies, as we do, every one must take refuge with the Church before the awful wrath of God. Even after death the poor sinner could not shake off the tyranny of the priests. For when he died, he still had to endure the torments of purgatory from which only the intercession of the Church, bought at top market prices, could deliver him.

In order that this mystery of iniquity, this gigantic fraud, might not be discovered, the Bible, the only means of discovering it, was removed from the eyes of the common people. Any one who dared voice a protest and bear witness to the truth was cruelly persecuted. When finally matters grew so bad that every one called for a reformation, how was it accomplished? The Pope called a synod to discuss the matter. This synod began operations in a most auspicious manner by burning the one man who could have been most helpful in carrying out a reformation: John Hus. The Pope, John XXIII, was really deposed, because even the debauched priests were ashamed of him. The new Pope promptly sent the synod home and ended the reformation. Things remained just as they had been, the same slavery obtained as before.

This picture is not exaggerated. Every one that knows conditions in the Catholic Church will concede that the same holds good, *mutatis mutandis*, to-day. The priests still ride and hound the people, and tyrannize their consciences, as much as they ever did. The great majority of the laity, of course, then as now, cared little. They paid as much as was required,

and no more, observed the rules of the Church as far as they were compelled to, in order to keep the priests at their distance, and for the rest lived securely and much as they pleased, only taking care to set aside a sufficient amount of money to pray them out of purgatory. But an anxious soul, earnestly concerned about his salvation, could by this system only be driven to despair.

Such an earnest soul was Martin Luther. If there ever was a man who really tried earnestly to keep all the commandments of the Church, to do everything that was required of him, that man was Luther. Still he found no peace. In spite of his holy life, in spite of his penances and prayers to the saints, he lived in constant dread of God and His judgment. Then one day he found a Bible in the recesses of the convent library. That was his salvation. He read, and as he read, the veil of error was lifted from his eyes, and he beheld for the first time the clear, pure light of the Gospel. The peace which he had been seeking in vain he found in Jesus. The way to the Throne of Grace was revealed to him. Through the vicarious atonement of Him who said, "I am the Way," he was assured of grace and full pardon for all his sins. This assurance gave him joy and comfort, and in his gladness he wished to tell others, who were still languishing under the tyranny of the Pope and his hierarchy. Luther did not set out with the purpose of reforming the Church, or of founding a new Church. He had experienced divine grace, he was at peace with God, and freed from all human tyranny, and he now wanted to lead other poor sinners, who were still in ignorance of the wonderful Gospel-message, to the knowledge of the same. Out of the fulness of his heart his mouth spoke. And the Lord guided and protected him, and signally blest his work. Other reformers had arisen before Luther, but all had failed. The papacy was too strongly intrenched in the consciences of men. By means of the so-called sacrament of the Mass the Pope had succeeded in intruding himself between God and man, and thus attained divine authority. Luther, however, standing squarely upon the Scriptures and

secure in his position, continued to preach the Gospel of Christ. He had chosen the right weapon, the only weapon that could prevail against the Pope and his minions. With the shining light of the Gospel turned upon it, the iniquity of popery could no longer remain concealed.

The Church of Rome realized this, and promptly resorted to its dread weapon, the ban. Luther was excommunicated for preaching the Gospel. But this only encouraged him, for now he recognized the Pope as the true Antichrist, the arch-foe of Christ and His Word, who wilfully and maliciously kept sinners from Christ, and persecuted those who dared preach the true Gospel. His writings became veritable hammer-blows, aimed at the powerful structure of popery, and causing the Roman hierarchy to tremble in its foundations. And the Lord was with him, prospering his work and crowning it with success. He led the young Augustinian friar to the chair of theology in Wittenberg, made the powerful Elector Frederick of Saxony his friend and protector, and caused his writings to spread with lightning speed to the ends of the earth, "as though the angels themselves had been the heralds."

It is often claimed that Luther was too sharp and violent in his denunciation of popery, that his language is altogether too strong and vehement. Critics that raise this claim do not understand Luther or his works, as so frequently critics have not the faintest understanding of the thing they criticize. They have no conception at all of the essence of the controversy, having not found the way to the Throne of Grace themselves. Luther knew whereof he spoke. He had experienced all the anguish of soul, the terrors of conscience, that only a terrified and despairing sinner could feel. He realized that the Pope, with his malicious and damnable teachings, was driving millions of sinners whom Christ had redeemed with His blood, into the same anguish and despair. He knew that grace was free to all. He pitied the poor souls who did not know it, and the brazen effrontery of the Pope, who kept them in ignorance, roused his anger. That a mere man dared to annul the promises

of God, dared to make conditional what the Son of God had made free for all, inflamed him to holy wrath, and was the prompting motive for all his scathing denunciations of the Pope and the Roman hierarchy. If we bear this in mind, and consider the terrible woe into which the Pope had plunged all Christendom, we shall not consider Luther too harsh and inconsiderate, but heartily agree with everything he says, and we shall thank God for this man, who discovered the mystery of iniquity, rekindled the beacon light of His Word, and opened again the way to the Throne of Grace.

St. Louis, Mo.

C. C. SCHMIDT (per *G. S.*).

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

PRAYER IN GENERAL.

(Continued.)

Matt. 4, 10: *Thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.*

This passage recalls the temptation of Jesus. The Prince of Peace and "the Prince of the World," John 12, 31, are in battle array. The Savior is tempted to doubt the Word of God, v. 3. Satan is baffled by an "It is written." Next, the Lord is to be tripped into disobedience by a misquoted passage of Scripture. The Tempter's lie is laid bare by another "It is written." Finally, Jesus is to reject Scripture. By diabolical art "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them" are shown the Lord, and the promise is made: "All these things will I give Thee," on this condition: "If Thou wilt fall down and worship me." The Savior immediately recognizes the device of the devil to lure Him from the path of humiliation. With disgust He says: "Get thee hence!" Begone! Now you are showing your true colors. Your name is *Satan, Adversary*;

you would thwart my plan, God's plan, for the salvation of sinful man. Worship thee! Such a demand is truly satanical. Worship is due to God only. "*Thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.*" Get thee hence! Thus the Lord Jesus repels His adversary, fighting as Man in man's stead by appealing to the Scriptures, the weapon all Christians should continually use in their spiritual battles. The quotation is from Deut. 6, 13: "Thou shalt fear the Lord, thy God, and serve Him, and shalt swear by His name." The emphasis indicated by text and context in the Hebrew, Deut. 6, 13, is brought out by our Lord's free quotation, introducing the word "only"—"Him *only* shalt thou serve,"—and by substituting the specific word "*worship*" for the general term "fear." Thus the intent of Deut. 6, 13 that "the Lord," *i. e.*, Jehovah, the true God, only is to be worshiped, is made apparent. To Him alone such honor is due.

Ps. 65, 2: *O Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come.*

The first strophe of Ps. 65 deals with the great blessings of the man dwelling in God's courts, that approaches Him in prayer. "*O Thou that hearest prayer,*" *i. e.*, it is an attribute of God to hear prayer; He is, if we translate the participle more closely, "*the Hearer of prayer.*" That is God's characteristic. He is willing, always ready, to hear prayer; and only He is able to do so. Hence: "*unto Thee,*"—not to idols, not to Mary nor to the saints,—"*unto Thee shall all flesh,*"—*all men, not only Israel, but "all flesh,"—you and I, and all that are in weariness and in need of an ear into which to pour our wants, necessities, and sorrows,—"*come.*" Only the true God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is able and willing to hear our prayer.*

Is. 63, 16: *Doubtless Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not. Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer; Thy name is from everlasting.*

This passage is part of a most beautiful prayer. Here the reason is given why Jehovah is entreated to look down upon

Israel with favor and to manifest His love towards them. "Doubtless," according to the Hebrew, might have been rendered simply by "for." "For Thou art our Father." The contrast in the text brings out the thought: Thou, Jehovah, Lord, art our *true* Father. Abraham and Israel, *i. e.*, Jacob, are fathers, it is true, and great men they were, great was their authority, great is the honor to be descended from them: but still they were but *men*. "Abraham is ignorant of us" now; he is dead; Jacob, Israel, acknowledges us not, *i. e.*, he has no knowledge of us, knows us not; he, too, is dead. Both are incapable of hearing prayer, much less, of answering it. "Thou, O Lord, Jehovah, art our Father." Jehovah is Thy covenant name. In the Messiah, the Redeemer, Thou hast covenanted to be our *Father*; we are Thy children for the Messiah's sake. This Messiah will redeem, aye, in Thy sight has already redeemed, Israel from all sin. To Him we take refuge; our sins are covered before Thy face. The barrier between Thee and us—sin—has been removed. Thou art our loving Father, who wilt hear when Thy children cry unto Thee. How can it be otherwise? "Our Redeemer, from everlasting is Thy name"; and as Thy name is, so wilt Thou deal with us.

Isaiah deals the Catholic saint-worship a mighty blow. Saint-worship is gross idolatry. Abraham and Jacob, both saints, cannot hear prayers. "Abraham is ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledges us not." Saint-worship has no command, no promise of being heard, and no example in the Scripture.

Phil. 4, 6: *Be careful for nothing, but in everything, by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God.*

What should we ask of God in our prayers? Phil. 4, 6 gives the answer: "*Be careful for nothing*," meden merimnate. Similar to this is Matt. 6, 25: "*Take no thought*"=be not careful, me merimnate, "as to your life," etc. "*Be careful for nothing*," does not argue for carelessness; but what St. Paul does wish the Philippian Christians to cultivate is the virtue

of casting all their care upon God, to cut loose from the anxious, carking, harassing cares for the things of this life, which are so apt to smother the thoughts pertaining to yonder life, and to hinder growth in sanctification. "Be careful for nothing," entertain no overanxious cares, but "cast all your care, *ten merimnan*, upon Him; for He careth for you." 1 Pet. 5, 7.

But cares, both temporal and spiritual, will crowd upon the Christians. What are they to do? Bring them to the Lord in prayer; "*let your requests be made known unto God.*" *pros ton Theon* = *before God*; lay the matter before Him. For means to help will fail Him never.

What requests are we to make known to God? All, both spiritual and temporal. There is no limitation whatever. "*In everything*" let your requests be known to God; be the matter great or small, pray. Cultivate the habit of bringing all that troubles you to your God in prayer. He knows your frame, and understands your cares. What an encouragement to pour out our hearts to God!

What a privilege to carry
Everything to God in prayer!
Oh, what peace we often forfeit,
Oh, what needless pain we bear,
All because we do not carry
Everything to God in prayer.

How should we make our requests known to God? "*By prayer and supplication with thanksgiving.*" Says *Lightfoot*: "*While proseuche*, prayer, is the general offering up of the wishes and desires to God, *deesis*, supplication, implies special petition for the supply of wants. Thus *proseuche*, prayer, points to the frame of mind of the petitioner, *deesis*, supplication, to the act of solicitation. The two occur together also in Eph. 6, 18; 1 Tim. 2, 1; 5, 5. In *itemata*, requests, again the *several objects* of *deesis* are implied." — "Great stress is laid on the duty of *eucharistia*, thanksgiving, by St. Paul; *e. g.*, Rom. 1, 21; 16, 6; 2 Cor. 1, 11; 4, 15; 9, 11, 12; Eph. 5, 20; Col. 2, 7; 3, 17; 1 Thess. 5, 18; 1 Tim. 2, 1. All his own letters to the churches, with the sole exception of the Epistle to the Galatians, commence

with an emphatic thanksgiving. In this epistle the injunction is in harmony with the repeated exhortations to cheerfulness, *chara*, which it contains."

Pray, offer up your requests "in everything"; send them to the throne of grace. *Supplicate*, lay this special trial, this special distress, this special trouble, before Him, and do not neglect, thou child of God, to *thank* Him for His manifold blessings which He daily and richly showers upon you. Is it a *spiritual* gift you crave for, observe the prayer of the publican, Luke 18, 13. Is it a *temporal* thing you desire, follow the example of the woman of Canaan, Matt. 15, 22—28. In child-like confidence say, "Abba, Father."

Springfield, Ill.

(To be continued.)

LOUIS WESSEL.

BOOK REVIEW.

LITURGY AND AGENDA. Abridged Edition. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 144 pp. Style M. Bound in select black Persian morocco leather, with red under gold edges, and gold cross on front cover, \$1.50. Style C. Bound in imitation black leather, edges red without gold, cross stamped in imitation gold leaf, \$1.20.

A delight to the eye and a relief to the mind of our pastors is furnished by this thoughtfully compiled and beautifully manufactured article. It contains all that the city pastor in his many-sided official activities and the traveling missionary need. The addition of prayers and Scripture-passages for use when visiting the sick and dying enhances the value of the booklet.

THE MODERN GRAMMAR. By Albert H. Miller. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 215 pages; 60 cts.

Little of text and much of exercise, simple rules and apt illustrations, rapid advance and constant review — these characteristics of the book are at the same time its recommendation.

THE LIFE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER FOR THE CHRISTIAN HOME. (92 illustrations.) By Dr. M. Reu. Wartburg Publishing House. 297 pages; \$1.25.

The story of Luther's life, here told in its important events and in a pleasing style, well serves the need of the Lutheran home for such a biography.

THE SMALL CATECHISM OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER. With Brief Explanations in Questions and Answers. Same author and publisher. 35 cts.

A German-English exposition of the Lutheran Catechism on parallel pages is here offered. It reduces the material to 335 questions and employs 229 Bible-texts. Considering the good judgment otherwise used in the compilation of the material in this book, it is a little surprising that the "Christian Questions" have been dropped—one of the best helps for communicants. The reason that the "Christian Questions" are not by Luther would be too pedantic. After all, they are *from* Luther. From the pedagogical point of view we consider this one of the best catechisms of the American Lutheran Church. It is the ripe fruit of a life that has been devoted chiefly to the study of the Catechism.

QUELLEN UND DOKUMENTE ZUR GESCHICHTE UND LEHRSTELLUNG DER EV.-LUTH. SYNODE VON IOWA U. A. ST. 5. und 6. Lieferung. Von Dr. Geo. J. Fritschel. 45 cts.

The documents reproduced in this serial publication are of great value to the historian of the American Lutheran Church, and it would be desirable, not only that this publication be continued, but that it should elicit similar publications from other Lutheran bodies.

WARTBURG HYMNAL FOR CHURCH, SCHOOL, AND HOME.

Same publisher. Text edition 462 pages; with music, 472 pages.

The threefold purpose which this book is to serve is well met by the selections of standard hymns for use at the service in church, and of hymns for private devotion such as are used in all Christian homes. The mechanical make-up, especially of the edition with music, is very good.

LUTHER PRIMER. A little book of goodly excerpts from the writings of Dr. Martin Luther. By *Albert T. W. Steinmeyer*. Survey Publishing Co., Columbia, S. C.

An excellent idea this, of studying the Reformer at important and interesting episodes in his life by means of his own writings. May this Primer be followed by a series of Readers.

THE ALLEGED "HISTORIC EPISCOPATE." By *David H. Bauslin*, D. D. Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, O.

Everybody will enjoy this common-sense review of the Episcopalian claim in 36 pages.

THE LUTHERANS OF NEW YORK. Their Story and their Problems. By *George U. Wenner*, D. D., LL. D. The Petersfield Press, New York. 160 pages; \$1.25.

The story of the New York Lutherans has been condensed into 72 pages brimful of interesting facts sympathetically told. The re-

mainder of the book discusses the problem of synods, of language, of membership, of religious education, of lapsed Lutherans. The author has just completed half a century of service at the same church in the metropolis, and has seen Lutheranism grow up in New York as no one else now living has.

A HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By Williston Walker. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 624 pages.

This volume is a marvel of conciseness, and yet teeming with life. The demarcation of historical periods (Beginnings to Gnostic Crisis, to Constantine, to Imperial State Church, to close of Investiture Controversy, Later Middle Ages, Reformation, pp. 335—480; Transition to Modern Religious Situation) shows where the author puts his emphases and indicates the general trend of his presentation. The story of the Church's development is told with that spice of detail which makes the reading a pleasure, not only a profit. The facts concerning the American Lutheran Church have been condensed into one page, which to a Lutheran seems unsatisfactory; but this, too, indicates what to an author who writes down epochs with a sweep commends itself as of primary importance. Really, in the religious life of America the Lutheran Church has not been prominent. Some people are just beginning to discover it even now.

THE COURSE OF CHRISTIAN HISTORY. By W. J. McGloughlin. The Macmillan Company, New York. 323 pages; \$2.00.

The Professor of Church History in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has written this book for his classes. He divides the nineteen centuries of Christianity into nine periods: 1 A. D. to 100, to 323, to 600, to 1050, to 1300, to 1517, to 1648, to 1789, to 1917. His subdivisions for the Fifth and the Sixth Period are Eastern and Western Christianity, for the Eighth: Roman Catholic Church, Lutheranism, Zwinglianism, Calvinism, Anabaptism, English Reformation, and for the last period, the great church-bodies of modern times. Barring an ominous silence on the story of Christ's birth in Matthew and Luke and Baptist bias on the subject of Infant Baptism, his surveys are exact and comprehensive. 58 pages of questions for review and suggestions for further study enhance the value of the book.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF RECONCILIATION. By James Denney, D. D. Geo. H. Doran Co., New York. 339 pp.

The author takes his stand with the expounders of the "moral influence" theory of the atonement, and in this class his treatise ranks high. He is very well read in this department of theology, and his reviews of the authors from whom he differs are fair. He rejects the legal or forensic teaching on the atonement — the *satisfactio vicaria* — and considers the term "merits of Christ" embarrassing to a theologian who wants to hold fast to the "moral personality" and "the moral power" of Christ, p. 23, and view "the whole business of salvation as transacted in the moral world." The work of Christ "meets divine

necessities in the moral world." p. 161. He thinks Luther was "carried away by a passion" when he "exulted in Christ's identification of Himself with men." p. 263. He delights in the stress which Luther placed on faith ("Luther is abundantly right in his emphasis on faith alone"). But faith, in his conception, is not so much the act of appropriating the reconciliation which Christ effected, as "the absolute committal of a person to the sin-bearing love of God for salvation. It is not simply the act of an instant, it is the attitude of a life." p. 291.

THE PILGRIMS AND THEIR HISTORY. By *Roland G. Usher*, *D. D.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 310 pp.; \$2.00.

THE STORY OF THE PILGRIMS FOR CHILDREN. Same author and publisher. 142 pp.; \$1.25.

THE MAYFLOWER PILGRIMS. By *Edmund James Carpenter*. The Abingdon Press. 255 pp.

The approaching tercentenary of the planting of the New England colonies no doubt has called forth these essays. They are all illustrated. They are all worked up out of the original records. Dr. Usher has studied those records with a keenly critical eye, and blasts some of our traditional beliefs regarding the Pilgrims by the evidence which he produces. He has, moreover, enriched his volume with bibliographical notes, for which students will be grateful. The little volume which he has written for children seeks to popularize the main facts which his research has yielded him.—Dr. Carpenter's book does not ask us often to look into the records, but he has reproduced every essential fact in them, and told them in a way that is both entertaining and instructive. The Lutheran influence on the Reformation in England which he touches in his first chapter has been underestimated.

BRITAIN AFTER THE PEACE. Revolution or Reconstruction. By *Brougham Villiers*. E. P. Dutton & Co. 249 pp.; \$2.50.

Written on British soil for Britains by a Britain, this book would seem not entitled to universal interest. But it is, decidedly. What the author relates about the vast social, commercial, and other changes which the war wrought, how conscription came to England, how resources of the nation were commandeered, etc., has all been duplicated here. In fact, one gets the impression that our part of the war is a replica of England's. But the remarkable feature of this book is that the author starts from the premise—and everything seems to prove it a true one—that the war has created a revolutionary condition throughout the world, and the coming of peace may accelerate revolutions that are now brewing. The question of employment for the soldiers that are being mustered out, of taxation to be levied upon impoverished peoples, of the readjustment of industries, etc., are taken up individually and calmly discussed. It is a most thoughtful book.

RECOLLECTIONS OF A RUSSIAN DIPLOMAT. The Suicide of Monarchs (William II and Nicholas II). By *Eugene de Schelking*. The Macmillan Co., New York. 327 pp.; \$2.50.

The former secretary of the Russian embassy in Berlin, who after the termination of his diplomatic career in 1903 went into political journalism, became connected with the Paris *Rouss* and *Le Temps*, then with the Petrograd *Novoie Wremya* and *Birjevia Wiedemosti*, and was very active as a Slavophil here, writes down his impressions of Alexander III, William II, and Nicholas II, and shows how the diplomatic maneuvers of the decades before the outbreak of the war tended to this awful catastrophe. The book is brimful of the most interesting episodes in high political life, to many of which the author was an eye-witness.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN PARIS. An Historical and Descriptive Sketch. By *Rev. W. Wackernagel, D.D.* General Council Publication House. 63 pp.; 25 cts. and 50 cts.

Did you know that in Paris there are 19 Lutheran churches? This well-written and illustrated booklet tells the story of Lutheranism in the capital of Paris and its *faubourgs*, how it obtained its peculiar character, what prospects the separation in 1906 opened up, etc.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE: *Amerikanischer Kalender fuer deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1919*; 15 cts.—*Lutheran Annual 1919*; 15 cts.—*White Buffalo*, by *Fr. J. Liesmann*; 74 pages; 35 cts.—*Concordia Collection of Sacred Choruses* and Anthems for more ambitious choral organizations: 1. Lord, Now Lettest Thou. *Ernst I. Erbe*. Mixed Choir and Bass Solo; 40 cts. 2. I Will Lift Up Mine Eyes. *Ernst I. Erbe*. Mixed Choir and Bass Solo; 60 cts.—*Holy Night*. Children's Christmas Service. *H. F. Bade* and *T. Struckmeyer*; dozen, 40 cts.

R. H. GENRICH (407 La Salle St.), Wausau, Wis.: *The Stockbridge Indians, Our Indian Missions, and an Appeal*; 15 cts.

LUTHERAN PUBLISHING Co., Lt. (201 Rundle St.), Adelaide, S. A.: *The Word of Saving Truth in Question and Answer*; 6 d.

NORTHWESTERN PUBLISHING HOUSE, Milwaukee: *The Ancient World*. A Compendium of Church History for Christian Students, by *Karl Koehler*; 25 cts. Write for sample, and encourage this enterprise.

AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN, Rock Island, Ill.: *Augustana Synodens Referat 1918*.—*Institutional Inner Missions*, by *Rev. V. J. Tengvald*; 25 cts.—*Olavus Petri, the Church Reformer of Sweden*, by *Nils Forsander*; 30 cts. and 60 cts.—*The Cas way*. A story for the young, by *Runa*.—*Elsie in the Uplands*. A vacation story, by *Mathilda Roos*. D.

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

Published in January, April, July, and October.

Subscription Price: \$1.25 a year. Remittances should be addressed and made payable to *Concordia Publishing House, Cor. Jefferson Ave. and Miami St., St. Louis, Mo.*

Contributions, Correspondence, and Publications for Review, should be addressed to *Professor W. H. T. Dau, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.*

